This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Special introduction to the study of the Old Testament

Francis Ernest Gigot

Digitized by Google

314 Gigot

ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
MDCCCCX
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

SPECIAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

SPECIAL INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

REV. FRANCIS E. GIGOT, S.S.,

Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.; Author of "Outlines of Jewish History," "Outlines of New Testament History," "General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," "Biblical Lectures."

PART II.

DIDACTIC BOOKS AND PROPHETICAL WRITINGS

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO:

BENZIGER BROTHERS,

Printers to the Holy Apostolic See.

Digitized by Google

Nihil Obstat.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL, D.D.,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur:

✠JOHN M. FARLEY,
Archbishop of New York.

NEW YORK, April 6, 1906.

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
SEP 4 1918
ANDOVER
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

COPYRIGHT, 1906, BY BENZIGER BROTHERS.

Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THE present volume is the second part of a work dealing with the historical and literary problems which nowadays are suggested by the scientific study of the sacred books of the Old Covenant. It is concerned with the *Didactic* and the *Prophetical* writings of the Old Testament Literature, and thus brings to completion the "Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament," the first volume of which, treating only of the *Historical* books, passed to a second edition some time ago. It examines the questions anent the Authorship, Date, Purpose, Contents, Literary Structure, etc., of each of the Didactic and the Prophetical writings in exactly the same manner as the preceding volume did the same important and difficult questions concerning the Historical books.

Both volumes are chiefly intended for the use of Biblical students of whom is expected a close acquaintance with the leading questions relative to the sacred books of the Old Covenant, as also with the more or less probable theories put forward in their connection. In both volumes the writer has almost invariably been satisfied with giving the arguments *for* or *against* the views, ancient and modern, which he has set forth. He has thought that, where faith was not at stake, it was usually better to refrain from expressing a preference of his own, and to leave full liberty to the teacher who will use the present work as a text-book, to pronounce himself in favor of the view on the side of which evidence seems to him to be preponderant. When, however, he has made his own, or has simply inclined towards, some recent critical view, he is conscious of having done so in full harmony with that truly Catholic and scientific spirit which is thus aptly described

Digitized by Google

by his Holiness, Pius X., in his recent letter to Mgr. Le Camus, bishop of La Rochelle: "As we must condemn the temerity of those who, having more regard for novelty than for the teaching authority of the Church, do not hesitate to adopt a critical method altogether too free; so we should not approve the attitude of those who in no way dare to depart from the usual exegesis of the Scripture, even when, faith not being at stake, the true progress of learning requires such departure. You follow a wise middle course; and show by your example that nothing is to be feared for the sacred books from the true advance of the art of criticism; nay, more: that a beneficial light may be derived from it, provided its use be coupled with a real prudence and discernment. . . . "[1]

The author feels confident that the favorable acceptance won by the first part of this "Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament" awaits also the present volume.

Finally, it is his hope soon to be able to publish his two volumes of "Special Introduction to the New Testament," and thus to complete the difficult undertaking of supplying Catholic students with up-to-date works introductory to the Sacred Scriptures.

St. Joseph's Seminary, N. Y., April, 1906.

[1] "Ut enim damnanda est eorum temeritas qui, plus tribuentes novitati quam magisterio Ecclesiæ, critices adhibere genus non dubitent immodice liberum; ita eorum ratio non probanda qui, in nulla re, ausint ab usitata exegesi Scripturæ recedere, etiam quum, salva fide, id bona studiorum incrementa postulent. Hos inter medius tu recta incedis; tuoque exemplo ostendis nihil timendum esse divinis libris a vera progressione artis criticæ, quin commodum ex hac subinde eis lumen peti posse, ita nempe si prudens sincerumque judicium huc accesserit. . . ." (Letter of January 11th, 1906.)

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE 5

DIVISION I.

THE DIDACTIC BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS 13

Principal Names and Doctrinal Purpose of the Didactic Books. Leading Poetical Features of the Didactic Books.

CHAPTER II.

THE BOOK OF JOB 29

Name and Position in the Canon. Chief Contents of the Book of Job. Integrity and Didactic Object. Historical Character and Date of Composition.

CHAPTER III.

THE PSALMS 56

Names and General Contents. Original Text and Principal Versions. The Numbering and Titles of the Psalms. Gradual Formation of the Psalter

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER I.

Preliminary Remarks on the Didactic Books.

Principal Names and Doctrinal Purpose of the Didactic Books.

II. Leading Poetical Features of the Didactic Books:

- **1. Parallelism:**
  - Discovery and Nature.
  - Various Kinds: Synonymous, Antithetic, Synthetic, Climactic — Parallelism.
  - Exegetical Importance.
- 2. Verse:
  - Existence.
  - Nature and Kinds (Ancient and Modern Theories).
- 3. Strophes:
  - Existence now admitted by all.
  - How distinguished?
- 4. Other Characteristics (Rhyme; Assonance; Alliteration).

Digitized by Google

DIVISION I.

THE DIDACTIC BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

§ 1. *Principal Names and Doctrinal Purpose of the Didactic Books.*

1. Principal Names given to the Didactic Books. The seven books, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus, occupy in the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and most modern versions of Holy Writ a central position among the Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament. They are placed between the historical books (Genesis–Esther), by which they are preceded, and the prophetical writings, by which they are followed. They make up a group of inspired works clearly distinct from both the historical and the prophetical books, and are, on that account, designated under special collective names. They are often called the *Sapiential* books, from the fact that they inculcate the notion and urge the practice of "Wisdom" as understood by the Hebrews of old.[1] Sometimes they are spoken of as the *Moral* writings of the Old Law, inasmuch as they deal with problems directly con-

[1] The name of *Sapiential* books is usually restricted to five books, viz.: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus.

Digitized by Google

nected with man's moral nature, and suggest or insist upon practical rules for righteous conduct. They are also sometimes called the *Poetical* books of the Old Testament, because nearly all of them are poetical compositions.[1] More commonly, however, they are designated as the *Didactic* writings, a title which well describes their most general characteristic. To the Hebrews of old, as also to Christians at large, they have always appeared, in regard to subject-matter and literary form, a wonderful treasury of varied and useful doctrine.

2. Doctrinal Purpose of the Didactic Books. While thus ascribing to the Didactic books a doctrinal purpose, we should not lose sight of the fact that the other books of the Old Law have also a similar object. This doctrinal object is especially manifest in connection with the prophetical writings, wherein threats and promises, strong rebukes and touching appeals, narration of past events and predictions of the future, are blended together with a view to bring home to the minds and hearts of the Jews the fundamental truths of Revelation and, in particular, the obligation incumbent on them all of a pure and loving service of Yahweh alone. But even in regard to the historical books of the Old Covenant this doctrinal purpose must be admitted, as was shown in treating of each one of them in the preceding volume.[2] The very books whose object seems to be almost exclusively confined to the chronicling of events have been really composed in order to inculcate those religious and moral lessons which were best suited to the place and times of the writers.[3]

[1] The Hebrews give the name of *Poetical* only to the books of Job, Psalms, and Proverbs; but it applies no less fully to the other didactic books, save, however, Ecclesiastes, a great part of which does not exhibit the poetical form.

[2] The volume referred to is the "Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament, Part I," by the present writer.

[3] Cp. II Tim. iii, 15, 16.

Digitized by Google

On account, then, of this doctrinal object, even the prophetical and historical works of the Old Testament may be called *Didactic*. This name, however, is especially, and indeed justly, reserved to indicate the series of books which is placed between them. While the usual topics and apparent object of the historical books are directly concerned with the narrative of past or contemporary events, and those of the prophetical writings with the summing up of oral exhortations and predictions delivered in Jehovah's name by His approved messengers, the topics almost exclusively dealt with in the didactic books, together with the distinct aim pursued therein, relate to doctrine. In fact, the didactic books of the Old Testament are doctrinal writings not only with respect to their contents—viz., the truths, moral, social, and religious, which they set forth—but also as regards the poetical form which they assume and which is particularly suited to the mind of the ancient Eastern nations for the purpose of imparting instruction of any kind.

§ 2. *Leading Poetical Features of the Didactic Books.*

1. Parallelism. The first and most characteristic feature of Hebrew poetry observable in the didactic books is that known, since the time of Bp. Lowth († 1787),[1] under the name of *Parallelism*. This scholar describes it in the following manner: "The correspondence of one verse or line with another, I call parallelism. When a proposition is delivered, and a second is subjoined to it, or drawn under it, equivalent, or contrasted with it in sense, or similar to it in the form of grammatical construction, these I call parallel lines; and the words or phrases answering to one another

[1] He was the first to clearly state and accurately describe that essential feature of Hebrew poetry, in his "De sacra poesi Hebræorum," Oxford, 1753, and his "Translation of Isaiah" (Preliminary Dissertation), London, 1778.

Digitized by Google

in the corresponding lines, parallel terms."[1] This correspondence of lines one to another, which is usually connected with an approach to equality in the length of the parallel lines and in their syllabic structure, is so striking a mark of Hebrew poetry "as plainly to discriminate in general the parts of the Hebrew Scriptures which are written in verse from those which are written in prose."[2]

Parallelism is of four principal kinds, to which names more or less descriptive have been given.

There is, first of all, the *Synonymous* Parallelism. In this kind (which is the most frequent) the parallel lines correspond to each other by expressing the same idea under different forms, generally, however, with some slight extension or modification of meaning, as:

> O Yahweh, in Thy strength the king doth rejoice,
> And in Thy salvation how greatly doth he exult!
> The desire of his heart Thou hast granted him,
> And the request of his lips Thou hast not denied.
>
> Ps. xx. 2 (Heb. xxi, 2).

There is, secondly, the *Antithetic* Parallelism, wherein the thought of the first line is emphasized by the contrasted thought and expression found in the second. Thus:

> A wise son maketh a glad father,
> But a foolish son is the grief of his mother. Prov. x, 1.

> For Yahweh knoweth the way of the righteous,
> But the way of the wicked shall perish. Ps. i, 6.

There is, thirdly, the *Synthetic* or *Constructive* Parallelism, in which the second line completes, proves, or elucidates in different ways[3] the thought expressed in the first. Thus:

[1] Preliminary Dissertation to Isaiah, p. ix (Boston, 1834).

[2] Rob. Lowth, loc. cit.

[3] "A comparison, a reason, a consequence, a motive, often constitutes one of the lines in a synthetic parallelism" (Driver, Introd to the Literat. of the O. Test., p. 363).

Digitized by Google

I call upon Yahweh with my voice,
And He heareth me from His holy hill.
I laid me down, and slept, and awoke,
For Yahweh sustaineth me. **Ps. iii, 5, 6.**

As a bird that wandereth from her nest,
So is a man that wandereth from his place.
Prov. xxvii, 8.

Answer not a fool according to his folly,
Lest thou also become like to him. **Prov. xxvi, 4.**

To these three kinds of parallelism discovered and described by Rob. Lowth a fourth one has been added by subsequent scholars, under the name of *Climactic* Parallelism. It is found only in lyric poetry and consists chiefly in this: the first line is itself incomplete, and the second takes up words from it and completes the sense, as:

The voice of Yahweh shaketh the wilderness,
Yahweh shaketh the wilderness *of Cades*.
Ps. xxviii (Heb. xxix), 8.

Intimately connected with the climactic parallelism is the unusual but graphic kind of parallelism with its stairlike movement, especially characteristic of the Pilgrim Psalms:[i]

I lift up my eyes to the hills
Whence cometh *my help:*
My help cometh from Yahweh,
Who made heaven and earth.

He will not suffer thy foot to stumble;
He will not *slumber, thy Keeper.*
Indeed He *slumbereth* not, and sleepeth not,
The *Keeper* of Israel.

[i] Pss. cxix-cxxxiii (Heb. cxx-cxxxiv). These Psalms are called *Gradual* Canticles in our Vulgate.

Digitized by Google

Yahweh is thy *Keeper*,
Is thy shade at thy right hand.
By day the sun will not smite thee,
Nor the moon by night.

Yahweh will *keep* thee from all evil,
He will *keep* thee, thyself.
He will *keep* thy going out and thy coming in
From now on even for ever.[1]

The last word of the second line (of this Psalm) becomes the first word of the third. The last two words of the sixth line are taken up in the seventh and eighth. The ninth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth lines repeat the *Keeper* of the eighth line.[2]

Other kinds of parallelism might be easily indicated; but these four are the best known and they are amply sufficient to illustrate this essential characteristic of Hebrew poetry. Moreover, the greater the number of classes admitted, the more difficult it is also to prevent one class from running into another, and to use such obscure kinds of parallelism for the purposes of exegesis or of textual criticism. Indeed, it is but seldom that any other kind of parallelism, besides the synonymous and the antithetic, offers a clue to the meaning of a passage, by suggesting its true reading or its true sense by means of the corresponding words in the parallel clause. As regards these two well-defined classes of parallelism, it is no exaggeration to say that the law of similarity or, on the contrary, of contrast, which prevails between the parallel synonymous or antithetic lines, "supplies an excellent means of understanding more correctly a large number of passages of Holy Writ. . . . Thus the sense of '*in virtute tua*' in the following verse,

Fiat pax in virtute tua,
Et abundantia in turribus tuis. (Ps. cxxi 7.)

[1] Ps. cxx (Heb. cxxi).

[2] Cfr. Chas. A Briggs, General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, p 367 sq.; F. Vigouroux, Manuel Biblique. vol. ii, no. 666 (on the word *Ma'aloth*).

Digitized by Google

is fixed by paying attention to the parallelism. Since the words '*in virtute*' correspond to '*in turribus*' in the next synonymous clause, they must have a similar sense and therefore refer to that which imparts strength to Jerusalem and secures peace to her. They consequently designate the walls of the Holy City,[1] as St. Jerome accurately renders in his own translation directly from the Hebrew, '*in muris tuis.*' In like manner, in Ps. lxxv, 3,

> Et factus est in pace locus ejus,
> Et habitatio ejus in Sion,

the expression '*in pace*' must designate Jerusalem, *Salem*, the city of peace, because it corresponds to Sion in the next clause. The parallelism is even useful at times to determine which is the true reading. Thus it shows that in the 17th verse of Ps. xxi, which is of such great importance, we should read, after our Latin Vulgate, *Kaarou*, *foderunt*, instead of *Kâari*, *as a lion*, as punctuated in the Massoretic text, because this latter reading is at variance with the parallelism:

> Foderunt manus meas et pedes meos,
> Dinumeraverunt omnia ossa mea."[2]

2. Verse. The existence of a Hebrew verse seems to have been recognized by several Fathers of the Church, but the study of the law of parallelism has made this existence more apparent. It has shown that the parallel clauses, taken singly, constitute so many distinct verses. It is true that many prominent scholars[3] still consider each line as only half a verse. But this view goes against two unques-

[1] The incorrect rendering of the Vulgate is traceable to a wrong punctuation of the Hebrew חיל by the Septuagint translators.

[2] VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 595. Cfr. also Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 161 (Engl. Transl.), for "Critical Arguments derived from the Poetic Parallelism."

[3] Among whom may be reckoned Prof. DRIVER and Father CONDAMIN, S.J.

Digitized by Google

tionable facts. First, the parallelism exists oftentimes among three consecutive lines,[1] which proves that every Hebrew line is not necessarily half a verse. Secondly, in some poetical pieces,—such, for instance, as Pss. cx, cxi (Hebr. cxi, cxii)—each parallel line begins with a letter of the alphabet in regular order, whence it is plain that Hebrew poetry counted each line as a distinct verse.[2]

In regard to the principle of measurement which should be applied to the Hebrew verse, the great law of parallelism has availed but little, and it must be confessed that, down to the present day, this principle remains unknown despite the various theories which have been framed to set it forth. The most ancient among these theories goes back to Philo († ab. 40 A.D.). According to him,[3] the mystic sect of Jewish Therapeutæ sang hymns and psalms of thanksgiving to God, which were either new or ancient ones composed by the old poets, who had left behind them measures and melodies of trimeter verses. Josephus († ab. 100 A.D.) speaks of the song of Moses at the Red Sea (Exod. xv) and of the lawgiver's canticle in Deuter. xxxii, as made up of hexameters, and of the Psalms of David as written in several metres, such as trimeters and pentameters.[4] In like manner, Eusebius of Cæsarea († ab. 338 A.D.) states in his *de Præparat. Evangel.*,[5] that the Canticle of Moses in Deut. xxxii and Ps. cxviii (Heb. cxix) were composed in the Greek heroic metre, i.e., in hexameters of 16 syllables, and that the Hebrews used trimeters in their other poetical works. Finally, St. Jerome († 420) appeals

[1] Cfr. Pss. vii, 6; xv, 3; xviii, 9 (Heb xvi, xix); Prov. i 22; etc.

[2] The divison into verses which runs throughout our editions of the Bible has nothing to do with the Hebrew *poetical* verse. It is a modern and conventional division of the Sacred Text for the sake of reference, and irrespective of prose or poetry.

[3] De Vita Contemplativa, § 3.

[4] Antiq. of the Jews, Book ii, chap. xvi, § 4; Book iv, chap. viii, § 44; Book vii, chap. xii. § 3.

[5] Book xi, chap. 5.

Digitized by Google

to such ancient authorities as Philo, Josephus, Origen, and Eusebius, as proving that almost all the poetry of Holy Writ is in metre similar to that of the odes of Horace, Pindar, and others. He thinks that Job (iii, 3–xlii, 6) is made up mainly of hexameters, with dactyls and spondees, and affirms that certain Psalms are in trimeter or tetrameter iambics.[1]

It is nowadays universally admitted that these ancient theories have no solid basis. Philo and Josephus were bent on magnifying their nation and its writings in the eyes of the Gentiles, and on showing that their race had anticipated the Greeks in literature and in philosophy. They must not therefore be considered as unbiassed witnesses, simply voicing an ancient tradition of the Jews relative to the nature of the Hebrew verse, but rather as polemists carried away by their desire to liken Hebrew poetry to the best classical productions with which they were acquainted. The erudite Greek scholar, Eusebius of Cæsarea, naturally took it for granted that the Hebrew verses resembled those of the Greeks; and we have the explicit testimony of St. Jerome to the effect that his own view regarding Scriptural poetry was not independent of those of Philo and Josephus.

As time went on, and it became more and more apparent that the likening of the Hebrew to the Greek and Latin poetry had no scientific basis,[2] modern scholars began to work in other directions in order to find a system of metres in Hebrew poetry. Thus Sir William Jones endeavored to apply the rules of Arabic metre to Hebrew. But this soon betrayed him into a total rejection of the Massoretic system of orthography and accentuation, and into conclusions which are far from satisfactory. "It is not consistent with prob-

[1] MIGNE, Patrol. Lat., Pref. to Job (vol. xxviii, col. 1081 sq.); Epistle to Paula (vol. xxii, col. 442 sq.).

[2] St. GREGORY of Nyssa was apparently the first to deny the resemblance of the Hebrew verse to the classical metres

Digitized by Google

ability," as justly remarked by a competent critic,[1] "that there could be any system of versification among the Hebrews like that imagined by Sir W. Jones, when in the example he quotes of Cant. i, 5, he refers the first clause of the verse to the second, and the last to the fifteenth, kind of Arabic metre." To which it may be added that the best Arabic scholars regard Arabic metres as comparatively late and as probably preceded by a freer prosody.

Most recently, and indeed with much greater ability, Gustav Bickell, the eminent Catholic professor of Oriental Literature in Vienna, has striven to explain the Hebrew verse after the analogy of the ancient Syriac metre.[2] According to him, Hebrew, like Syriac, poetry does not measure syllables, but counts them in regular order. The Hebrew verse is made up of a fixed number of syllables, without distinction between long and short. There is also a constant alternation of accented and unaccented syllables, so that only—to use terms borrowed from classic prosody—*iambic* and *trochaic* feet are possible. The accent is generally on the penult, and its position must be determined by means, not of the Massoretic rules of accentuation, but after the analogy of the Syriac language. The Massoretic vocalization is also easily discarded, and the Aramaic put in its place. In this wise, Dr. Bickell obtains verses of five, six, seven, eight, ten, and twelve syllables, and a few of varying numbers, most Hebrew verses being, as he thinks, heptasyllabic.

Dr. Bickell's theory, however attractive to many, has

[1] William Addis WRIGHT, art. Poetry (Hebrew), in SMITH, Bible Dict., vol iii, p. 2555 (Amer. Ed.).

[2] He had been preceded in this regard by Fr. LE HIR, S.S., in "Le Rhythme chez les Hébreux, le livre de Job," pp. 183–215. Dr. BICKELL's leading theoretical works in reference to Hebrew Poetry are "Metrices Biblicæ regulæ exemplis illustratæ" (Innsbruck, 1879) and "Supplementum" (1879). He has applied his theory to the entire Psalter, Proverbs, Job, Lamentations, Song of Songs, most of the poems of the historical books, and a great deal of the poetry in the Prophets.

Digitized by Google

never been fully endorsed by critics. Their chief objection to it arises from the fact that textual changes and the metrical licenses required by his system are too often arbitrary. All grant, however, that many of the emendations advocated by him in consequence of his metrics should not be lightly set aside.

Other scholars have looked for the determining principle of the Hebrew verse in another direction. Instead of striving to apply to Hebrew poetry the rules of Arabic or Syriac prosody, they have endeavored to liken it to that of the Babylonians and Egyptians,[1] which measured lines by accents or rhythmical beats, the "foot" not necessarily consisting of the same number of syllables. Such a principle of measurement, it is claimed, is distinctly in harmony (1) with the power of the accent in Hebrew prose, and more especially in Hebrew poetry, and (2) with the general characteristic of Hebrew poetical composition wherein the external form is entirely subordinated to the internal emotion, so that the poet is always at liberty to add or, on the contrary, to subtract one or several rhythmical beats as required by his present thought and feeling. According to Dr. Briggs,[2] one of the leading advocates of this theory, "three beats of the accent give us trimeters, four tetrameters, five pentameters, and six hexameters. All these measures appear in Hebrew, as they do in Babylonian and Egyptian, poetry. There are no dimeter lines, except occasionally in connection with trimeters and tetrameters, to vary the measure."

Although the scholars who attempt to liken the Hebrew

[1] There is no doubt that Hebrew poetry resembles the Babylonian and Assyrian poetry in regard to the general law of parallelism already described, as proved by recent discoveries of Assyrian, Babylonian, and Accadian hymns.

[2] General Introd. to the Study of Holy Scripture, p. 376 Dr. BRIGGS' labors to establish the principle of measurement by accents began as early as 1881, and deserve serious consideration. See particularly chaps. xiv and xv of his "General Introduction" just referred to.

Digitized by Google

poetical line to the Egyptian and Babylonian verse have the great advantage of preserving intact the Massoretic accentuation over those who would liken it to the Arabic or Syriac verse, yet it remains true that even their theory is as yet little more than a "conjecture."[1] Egyptian and Babylonian poetry is surrounded with at least as much obscurity as that of Israel. The Hebrew accent plays, it is true, a very important part in the vocalization of every word in any sentence, but there is no proof that the part it plays in a poetical line is so much greater than that which it plays in prose composition, or that it *must* be regarded as the determining principle of the Hebrew verse. Indeed, the very fact that in Hebrew poetry "the external form is entirely subordinated to the internal emotion of the poet"[2] seems to introduce into it such a variable element, in regard to the greater or smaller number of rhythmical accents, as to well-nigh exclude from the verse a fixed principle of measurement by accents.

3. **Strophes.** As the Hebrew poetical line is distinct from the classical verse, ancient or modern, so is the Hebrew strophe or stanza distinct from that of ancient or modern classical poetry. The difference, in fact, is so great between these two kinds of strophes that the existence of a strophical arrangement of Hebrew lines remained unsuspected till 1831, when F. B. Köster called the attention of scholars to it.[3] And yet it remains true that though we would look in vain in Hebrew poetry for that strict grouping of lines of a determinate length and character, and recurring regularly in the course of an ode, which consti-

[1] DRIVER. Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 362, footn.

[2] Chas. A BRIGGS, Introd. to the Study of Holy Scripture, p. 365. See also DRIVER'S Introduction, p. 365.

[3] In "The Strophes, or the Parallelism of the Verses in Hebrew Poetry" (Theol. Studien und Krit., pp. 40–114).

Digitized by Google

tutes the classical strophe or stanza, still something analogous to it must be and is admitted as a special feature of Hebrew poems. It is now generally granted that oftentimes Hebrew poets grouped together a certain number of lines and marked them off from either the preceding or the following groups of verses. All such groups are therefore rightly called strophes, although they stand usually in relation to one another in about the same unfettered way as is the case with the rhythmical beats in the separate verses.

Despite the many difficulties which surround the distribution of the lines of a Hebrew poem into distinct strophes, certain general means of discerning such larger portions have been pointed out by scholars. First of all, reference should be had to the sense. A Hebrew strophe expresses a relatively complete train of thought by means of a series of verses. The idea to be set forth, or at least the principal one if there be several, receives its full and harmonious development only at the end of a group of verses, when a new idea of a similar, different, or even opposite kind begins likewise to be expanded in a group of lines which constitutes a new strophe. So that the full development of a leading idea marks naturally the end of a strophe, and the introduction of another principal thought the beginning of another strophe or stanza. It goes without saying that when the strophes thus determined by the sense are, moreover, found to follow the same principles of parallelism as the lines themselves, and to be clearly synonymous or antithetic, etc., to one another, their actual distinction appears still more evident and must needs be admitted. An application of this first criterion to Ps. ii, for instance, shows that it is made up of four strophes—verses 1–3, 4–6^{b}, 6^{c}–9, 10–13—the first two of which are distinctly antithetic to each other.

Digitized by Google

A second but external means of dividing a poem into its component strophes is found in the "refrain" or burden, which is repeated at regular intervals in some Psalms. A good example of this occurs in Pss. xli and xlii,[1] which are really one, and where the following "refrain"—

> Why art thou bowed down, O my soul, and moaning within me?
> Wait on Elohim, for even yet shall I praise Him,
> The Deliverer of my face, and my Elohim!

—marks the end of three strophes (Ps. xli, 6, 12; Ps. xlii, 5).

A third means—an external one also—is supposed by some scholars to be furnished by the word "*Selah.*" According to them, this word, of unknown meaning, would, wherever found, mark the strophical divisions of the poem. This is very doubtful, to say the least. It cannot well be denied, however, that in certain Psalms (Pss. iii, xxxix, lxvi, etc.) it is really placed at the end of a strophe.[2]

A last means of marking the strophes is the alphabet, whereby the line or the strophe begins with successive letters of the Hebrew alphabet. These successive letters mark the initial lines sometimes in the simplest strophes, viz., the couplets, as in Pss. xxxiii, cxliv; sometimes in strophes of four lines, as in Pss. ix and xxxvi; and also in longer strophes, as, for instance, in Ps. cxviii, where every couplet begins with the same letter of the alphabet eight times repeated in each strophe.[3]

4. Other Poetical Characteristics. Three other characteristics of Hebrew poetry deserve a passing mention These are Rhyme, Assonance, and Alliteration.

[1] Heb. xlii, xliii. In Ps. viii the refrain begins the first strophe and closes the second. It should be borne in mind, however, that the refrain is far from being a sure test of strophical divisions in Hebrew poetry.

[2] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique. vol. ii, no. 208, § 4, footn.

[3] For further details regarding strophes in Hebrew poetry, see Chas. A. BRIGGS, General Introd., pp. 398–414.

Digitized by Google

Rhyme proper, or correspondence in the sound of the last syllable of one line to that of the last syllable of another, was known to the ancient Hebrews, but never became an important factor in their poetry. It exists in some Psalms,[1] where it is used with great effect; but this seldom extends beyond a couplet or triplet of verses. Moreover, the principle of rhyme remains entirely free, and is not developed into a system.

Another occasional peculiarity in Hebrew poetry is *assonance*, i.e., the correspondence of the vowels but not of the consonants in rhyming syllables, or the frequent repetition of a syllable in a poem more or less extended. As an example of assonance of this latter kind, Ps. cxxiii (in the Heb.), wherein the syllable *nu* occurs frequently, is often pointed out.

As regards *alliteration*, or frequent recurrence of an initial letter or sound in the accented words, it is well known that the Hebrews were fond of it. Examples without number could be indicated in connection with Pss. ii, xxii, lxxii (Vulgate xxi, lxxi), etc., etc.

To these secondary features of versification may be added *plays upon words*, which are so frequent in Hebrew poetry.[2]

[1] Pss. viii, xviii, etc.

[2] For details regarding these minor features of Hebrew poetry, see art. Alliteration, by I. M. Casanowicz, in the Jewish Encyclopædia, vol. i, p. 424.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER II.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

I. NAME AND POSITION IN THE CANON:

- 1. The Name and its Derivation.
- 2. Position in the Canon
  - of the Jews: in the Hagiographa, after Psalms and Proverbs.
  - of Christians: between Esther and Psalms.

II. CHIEF CONTENTS:

- 1. Prologue (i–ii).
- 2. Poetical Part:
  - Job's Lament (iii).
  - Debate between Job and his Friends (iv–xxxi).
  - The Speeches of Eliu (xxxii–xxxvii).
  - Yahweh's Intervention (xxxviii–xlii, 6).
- 3. Epilogue (xlii, 7–16).

III. INTEGRITY AND GENERAL OBJECT:

- 1. Integrity:
  - Comparison between the Hebrew Text and the Septuagint Version.
  - Difficulties against the Genuineness of certain Parts Stated and Examined.
- 2. General Object: Deals with the relation of suffering to sin.

IV. HISTORICAL CHARACTER AND DATE OF COMPOSITION:

- 1. Historical Character:
  - The Book of Job not exclusively a Work of the Imagination.
  - Traditional Data utilized by the Writer.
- 2. Date of Composition:
  - The Author's name unknown.
  - The Date of writing not fully ascertained.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

§ 1. *Name and Position in the Canon.*

1. Name. The book of Job is thus named, like the books of Tobias, Judith, and Esther, from its great hero. In a postscript to the Septuagint the name of Job is connected with that of the Idumæan king *Jobab*,[1] and apparently represented as its shorter form. But the resemblance of the two names in the Greek language[2] is most likely the main reason for which the late and uncritical author of the postscript took the Hebrew word *'Iyyōb* to be an abbreviation of *Yobhab*. Having set aside this improbable derivation, most recent critics have attempted to give to the word *'Iyyōb* such a derivation, from either a Hebrew or an Arabic root, as would symbolize the character of the patriarch Job. But neither the derivation of the name from the Hebrew that would make it mean "one persecuted" by Satan, or by his friends, or by calamity, nor its derivation from the Arabic so that it would signify "the penitent one, or pious, ever turning" to God, is probable. There is no indication in the book or in tradition that the writer of Job selected a symbolical name for his hero, so the derivation of the name remains doubtful.

2. Position in the Canon. In the Septuagint, Vulgate, and English Versions the book of Job comes immedi-

[1] Jobab is named as one of the kings of Edom in Gen. xxxvi, 33.
[2] In Greek 'Ἰὼβ might well appear to be an abbreviated form of 'Ἰωβαβ.

Digitized by Google

ately after the book of Esther and before the Psalter. This position was no doubt assigned to it because, on the one hand, its full historical character in narrating particular events was regarded as no less unquestionably established than that of the preceding historical books; while, on the other hand, the well-known fact that the Hebrews of old treated it as one of their poetical books seemed to justify its place before the book of Psalms. So that in a list of the sacred books which, like that of the Septuagint—followed by the Vulgate and the English Versions,—arranged the inspired writings after a topical order, the book of Job was, and is still, rightly considered as intermediate between the historical books by which it is preceded and the didactic writings by which it is followed.[1]

In the Hebrew Scriptures the book of Job is found in the Third Canon, that of the *Kᶜthûbhîm* or "the Writings" (more commonly called "the Hagiographa"). It stands third among them, and is usually placed after Psalms and Proverbs. According to the Talmud, its place in the Third Canon should be after Ruth and Psalms, and before Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, etc. Its inclusion among the Hagiographa is no doubt significant. It points to a late date as the one at which Job was recognized as canonical, and probably also to a comparatively late date for its composition. As regards its insertion by the Talmudists between Ruth and Psalms, and the Solomonic writings of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, etc., it may be safely asserted that it has no critical or historical importance.[2]

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX Manuel Biblique. vol. ii. no. 584.
[2] Cfr. H. E. RYLE, the Canon of the Old Test., p. 229 sq.

Digitized by Google

§ 2. *Chief Contents of the Book of Job.*

1. The Prologue. The book opens with a Prologue (chaps. 1–2) written in prose, the purpose of which is to make known the person of Job and the occasion of the calamities which befell him. Job was a wealthy man of exemplary righteousness, living outside of Israel, in the land of Hus, on the borders of Edom. On a certain day, "when the sons of God had come to stand before Yahweh,"[1] the disinterestedness of his piety was called in question by "the Satan,"[2] or Adversary,[3] who claimed that Job's virtue would not withstand a reverse of fortune. Then it was that, with God's permission to afflict Job without touching his person, Satan deprived him so suddenly of all his property and children that after each calamity only one messenger survived to announce it. Thus stripped of all his possessions, and bereaved of his children, Job manifested the deepest grief, but bowed submissively, and hence, "in all this, Job sinned not, and spoke not impiously against Elohim."

Again the heavenly council was convened, and Satan appeared, together with "the sons of God," in Yahweh's presence. Again Job was the subject of commendation on the part of God, who upbraided Satan with instigating Him unjustly against His faithful servant. Satan replied that the trial had not been sufficiently severe: if afflicted in his person, Job would prove unfaithful. Satan was therefore permitted to afflict Job with bodily sufferings, with the restriction, however, that his life should be spared. Yet, though smitten with a loathsome disease, and urged by his

[1] Job i, 6.

[2] The article is used in the Hebrew Text.

[3] The word "Satan" designates one who opposes another in his purpose, pretensions, and claims (Zachary iii, 1; I Kings xxix, 4; II Kings xix, 22 (Heb., verse 23): III Kings xi, 14, 23, 25). See Comment. of KNABENBAUER, S.J., LESÊTRE, A. B. DAVIDSON, etc., on Job.

Digitized by Google

wife to "curse Elohim and die," God's servant remained steadfast in his piety. A few months intervened,[1] during which three of his friends, having heard of his afflictions, came to condole with him. Struck dumb at the sight of Job's misery, they sat beside him in silence during seven days, expressing thus their feelings of dire distress.

2. The Poetical Part. After this introduction the poem proper begins with a *lament* on the part of Job, which takes up the whole third chapter of the book. His passionate cry for death "passes through three phases. In the first (iii, 3–10), he curses bitterly the day of his birth, wishing himself unborn; in the second (iii, 11–19), he asks why, if he must needs be born, he did not pass at once to the grave; in the third (iii, 20–26), he expresses his mournful surprise that life should be prolonged to those who, in their misery, long only for death."[2]

These loud and despairing complaints shocked his friends, who, no longer able to restrain themselves, began a debate with Job on the subject of his afflictions. This debate consists of three cycles of poetical speeches (chaps. iv–xiv; xv–xxi; xxii–xxxi); and each cycle comprises six speeches, one by each of the three friends, with Job's reply to each.

In the first cycle, Eliphaz, Baldad, and Sophar, Job's friends, draw arguments from the general conception of God to vindicate His righteousness in His dealings with Job. Eliphaz appeals to His *universal goodness*, which does not allow the righteous to perish under affliction; to which Job replies that death plainly awaits him, and that his sins have not merited the sufferings he undergoes. Baldad calls upon God's *discriminating justice* to prove that if Job's

[1] Cfr. Job vii, 3; xix, 13 sqq.
[2] Driver, Introd. to the Literature of the Old Test., p. 415.

Digitized by Google

children have perished, it was because they were vicious persons; if Job himself is pure, let him turn to God and seek mercy from Him. To this Job answers that God destroys according to His pleasure the innocent and the guilty, and that he himself is an illustration of this truth, since he is innocent and has no hope of restoration. Sophar insists on God's *omniscience*. He knows—what is unknown to Job—Job's guilt, and punishes him therefor. In answer, Job maintains that bad men are prosperous in this world; warns his friends not to defend so badly the justice of God, and pleads his cause before the Almighty.

In the second cycle, Job's friends adopt a different line of argument. To prove the justice of God they appeal to His government of men, to the operation of His providence in the world, as observed in the fate of the wicked. Eliphaz contends with great vigor that both experience and the lessons of the ancients prove that wicked men are not only in continual terror, but meet with a terrible end. Job, rejected by God and man, affirms that his innocence is fully known to God, and that nothing is before him but death. Baldad, in his second speech, attributes the punishment of the sinner "to the order of nature and the moral instinct of mankind, both of which rise up against the sinner,"[1] so that misery in life and dishonor after death are the sure lot of the wicked. Again Job asserts his innocence, of which he is so fully conscious that his previous wish becomes a firm hope that God will appear and establish his innocence: this he ardently longs for.[2] The second speech of Sophar enlarges on the brevity of the sinner's prosperity, and explains it from the retributive operation of sin itself. Job

[1] A. B. Davidson, Comm on Job, p. 130.

[2] With regard to the celebrated passage rendered in the Latin Vulgate by "Scio quod redemptor meus vivit . . . ," see "General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures" by the present writer, and the works referred to there.

Digitized by Google

continues to maintain that sinners are happy, constantly happy as proved by experience, and that they die in peace and are buried in honor.

Seeing their inability to bring home to Job the sense of his guilt by means of the reasons they had hitherto set forth, his friends start a new line of argument in the third cycle of speeches. They now charge him openly with great crimes as the reason for which he is subjected to suffering. Eliphaz is the first to prefer this charge against him. Assuming that God deals with men according to their ways, and that He cannot chastise Job for his piety, he concludes that the cause of his afflictions lies in his sins, in such sins as are usually committed by a rich ruler of the East, and exhorts him feelingly to reconcile himself with God. In his reply, Job complains that while he himself, though innocent, cannot secure vindication and peace from God, numerous guilty men live in prosperity and die in peace in the world, so that the divine rectitude cannot be appealed to in either case. The rejoinder of Baldad is a protest against Job's presumption in thinking that he would be found innocent at God's judgment-seat, and in impeaching the rectitude of God's rule in the world. God is infinite in His majesty and holiness, and man, who is but a worm, cannot be pure before Him. This, Job says, was very well known to him, and he describes the grandeur and purity of the divine majesty even better than Baldad had done. He "thus indirectly reminds his friends that the question at issue turns not on God's *greatness*, but on His justice."[1] In this last cycle, the third speaker, Sophar, fails to reply; and after a pause Job resumes his discourse. In several chapters "he defends his innocence and his doctrine of the divine distribution of happiness and misery. Were he conscious of evil, he would not have appealed to the judgment of his

[1] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 421.

Digitized by Google

Maker. But although God does distribute happiness and misery according to His own pleasure, yet he has always reasons, which man is incompetent to explore. He then depicts his former condition and his pious conduct, contrasting with it, his present state of wretchedness, in order to show that his losses are not attributable to any crime of his. He expresses at last another wish to be able to vindicate himself before God."[1]

After Job's earnest appeal to God with which "his words" are said "to be ended" (chap. xxxi, 40), one would naturally look for Yahweh's immediate intervention in behalf of His servant. Instead of this, however, Eliu, a young bystander during the debate, is introduced in a few lines of prose. In his long poetical speech which follows he declares that both parties have gone too far, the friends of Job in charging him with crimes, and Job himself in maintaining his innocence and so accusing God of injustice. He agrees with the former that misery is the punishment of sin, and that the innocent cannot for ever be unhappy, and thinks that the latter may have committed sins unconsciously. Men are often afflicted for gracious purposes, to humble them and then restore them to favor; in all cases the divine chastisements should be received with submission. Eliu concludes his discourse with a fine description of several divine attributes.

It is only at this point that Yahweh intervenes to answer Job "out of a whirlwind." He first proposes to His servant (xxxviii–xxxix)[2] questions on the creation and organization of the physical world and of the animal kingdom, to answer which it would have been necessary for Job to have taken part in the creation and have mastered its whole plan. This leads Job to acknowledge his ignorance and

[1] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test. (Eng. Transl.), p. 460.
[2] In the Hebrew, chaps. xxxviii-xl, 5.

Digitized by Google

also his presumption in having dared to contend with God. In His second speech, Yahweh convinces Job of his error in charging Him with injustice in governing the world and afflicting him, and consequently in his answer Job gives up all doubts and repents his former words in dust and ashes (xl–xlii, 6).

3. **The Epilogue.** The book of Job concludes with an Epilogue in prose (xlii, 7–16).[1] Yahweh expresses his displeasure with Eliphaz and his two friends, who had not spoken so justly of Him as Job himself had done. He directs them to present a burnt-offering and secure the prayers of Job in their behalf. Job is then restored to health, and his wealth is doubled. He receives as many sons and daughters as before, and dies in a good old age.

§ 3. *Integrity and Didactic Object.*

1. **Integrity.** The book of Job is one of the Old Testament writings concerning the integrity of which contemporary scholars are most at variance. Students of textual criticism widely differ as to the extent of critical emendation required by the present condition of its text, and higher critics are no less divided as to those larger parts of the book which should be considered as entering from the first into its composition. Only a brief treatment of these two vexed questions can be given here.[2]

In regard to the first point it is now generally granted that the Massoretic Text of Job, from which our Latin Vulgate is practically a direct rendering, needs not a little critical emendation on account of the obscurities and other difficulties which it presents in many places. This appears

[1] In the Hebrew, chap xlii, 7–17.

[2] For detailed information the student is particularly referred to Jas. HASTINGS, Dictionary of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 663 sqq., and the works mentioned there

Digitized by Google

all the more probable because, on the one hand, it has long been known from Origen's testimony[1] that the Septuagint Version, which was made from a Hebrew Text older than the Massoretic, was shorter than our Hebrew Text by some seven hundred lines; and because, on the other hand, the Coptic translation of the Septuagint published in 1889 by Ciasca, and exhibiting the pre-Origenian state of the Greek text, has fully borne out Origen's testimony. In view of these data, and also in virtue of their own metrical theories concerning Hebrew poetry, some critics—among whom stands prominently Dr. Bickell—have maintained the superiority of the Septuagint Text to that of our Hebrew Textus Receptus. They have attempted to reconstruct the Hebrew Text[2] and to show that the book in its present state has grown by additions which were successively made to a much shorter poem. All such attempts, however, though evincing great learning and ingenuity on the part of their authors, have appeared so sweeping and arbitrary in many of the alterations advocated that they have not met with much acceptance. Moreover, it has been felt and emphatically stated by the leading defenders of the superiority of the Massoretic Text over the shorter text of the Septuagint[3] "that the omissions of the Greek Version do not relieve the chief difficulties which attend the text of the book as it stands, whilst in several cases, at least, it is difficult to understand the context without these omitted passages or to explain how, if they did not form part of the original text, the passages in the Hebrew came to be added to it. Glosses

[1] Epistle to Africanus, § 4. See also St. JEROME, Pref. to Job.

[2] The most important attempts at reconstruction are those of A. MERX, das Gedicht von Iob; BICKELL, Carmina Vet. Test., translat. by E. J. DILLON, Sceptics of the Old Test.; K. BUDDE, Hiob; C. SIEGFRIED, the Book of Job, in "The Sacred Books of the Old Test.," edit. by P. HAUPT; LOISY, le Livre de Job; D B DUHM, das Buch Hiob.

[3] Among them may be mentioned A. DILLMANN; Prof DRIVER; K. BUDDE (in his latest work on Job); etc.

Digitized by Google

and amplifications on such a scale generally declare themselves as such beyond much possibility of question."[1] The truth, as it seems to us, lies between the two extreme views concerning the relation of the Hebrew Text to the Septuagint Version: while the Massoretic Text is less pure than its defenders are willing to grant, the Septuagint translation should not be relied on implicitly. The author of the latter is unknown and his method of rendering may have been very lax. Yet, from both extrinsic and intrinsic data, it may be safely said that it points to a text considerably shorter than our Hebrew Textus Receptus.

As regards the questions of higher criticism relating to the integrity of the book of Job, the tendency among most modern interpreters is to hold that the book, as we now possess it, is the outcome of more or less gradual accretion. Some among them[2] would reduce the size of the book by at least one half. They think that the prose portions (Prologue and Epilogue), together with the long poetical parts which now make up the speeches of Eliu and of Yahweh, did not form part of the original poem, which merely controverted the current doctrine of reward and punishment and therefore concluded with Job's last long discourse, where we now read "the words of Job are ended." They hold also that even the portions having a right to be considered as integrant parts of the original poem, viz., the three cycles of speeches between Job and his friends, have been added to in different places and considerably altered in character. Hardly less extensive changes are advocated by Merx, Bateson, Wright, Cheyne, and others; while the speeches of Eliu and a few other sections (chaps. xxvii, 7–xxviii; xl, 10–xli, 25)[3] are practically the only ones which such careful critics as Chas.

[1] W. T. Davison, art. Job, in Hastings, Dict of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 664.
[2] Such critics as G. Bickell, D. B. Duhm, etc.
[3] In the Heb. xl, 15–xli, 34.

Digitized by Google

H. H. Wright[1] and A. B. Davidson[2] would consider as later additions.

The first to regard the Prologue and Epilogue as not belonging to the original book was Rich. Simon. The main difficulties now urged in favor of that view arise from their apparent inconsistency with the poetical part of the book. While it is granted that the cycles of speeches in general presuppose the main facts of the story in the Prologue, it is said that in chap. xix, 15 sqq., the survival of Job's children and servants is referred to in opposition to the statements in the Prologue (i, 16 sqq.). Again, the Prologue ascribes the trials of Job to Satan, whereas no being of the kind is even hinted at by Job or his friends in the poetical part of the book. In the prose Prologue Job is a model of patience, and yet as soon as he speaks in verse his language betrays impatience, defiance, almost impiety. The ascription of Job's sufferings in the Prologue to God's design to try his righteousness is apparently unknown in the body of the work. As regards the Epilogue, it "seems to spoil the whole book by rehabilitating the very doctrine which the book was written to disprove. Job, restored to health and prosperity and living to a good old age, would have been a triumphant example of the doctrine that, sooner or later, the righteous were rewarded in this life."[3] Finally, in both the Prologue and the Epilogue the offering of sacrifice is regarded as the appointed means to placate the Deity,[4] while repentance alone is insisted upon for that purpose in the body of the work.[5] To account for these and other such apparent inconsistencies, Duhm, D. B. Macdonald, and others regard the Prologue and Epilogue as having formed

[1] An Introduction to the Old Test., p. 150 sq.
[2] The Book of Job, in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.
[3] W. H. Bennett and W. F. Adeney, Biblical Introduction, p. 127.
[4] Cfr. i, 5; xlii, 8.
[5] Cfr. v, 8 sqq.; viii, 20; xi, 13 sqq.; etc.

Digitized by Google

primitively part of a prose story of Job,[1] in which he was made to speak more reverently of God than his friends did,[2] but of which nothing is now extant save the present Prologue and Epilogue in the book of Job.

Scholars who are wont to account for discrepancies in Holy Writ by appealing to divergent sources of information faithfully transcribed or utilized by subsequent writers will naturally feel inclined to admit some such theory in the present case. And yet numerous critics who have examined in detail the various difficulties just stated consider them as insufficient evidence.[3] Furthermore, they remind us that "some introduction and conclusion must have accompanied the poetical part," and that "there is no evidence or probability that any others, different from those now found, ever existed."[4] Even such critics as E. Reuss, C. Siegfried, E. Kautzsch, etc., do not hesitate to recognize that the present Prologue is indissolubly connected with the body of the work,[5] and to admit that in the writer's time "the author of the book of Job felt it necessary to assert the final bliss of the righteous, even at the cost of inconsistency."[6]

The objections usually raised against chaps. xxvii, 7–xxviii as forming a part of the primitive composition are generally regarded as more serious than those urged against the Prologue and Epilogue. They are briefly as follows: First, there is an apparent contradiction between the sentiments which Job expresses in that section and those he gives vent to both before and after.[7] In the second place, it is diffi-

[1] DUHM calls it "a popular book," *Volksbuch*.

[2] Cfr. Job xlii. 7.

[3] For a detailed examination of those difficulties, see particularly A. B. DAVIDSON, the Book of Job, pp. xxx–xxxv.

[4] A. B. DAVIDSON, loc. cit.

[5] Cfr. E. KAUTZSCH, An Outline of the History of the Literature of the Old Test., p. 157 (Engl. Transl.).

[6] W. H. BENNETT, loc. cit.

[7] Contrast, for instance, xxvii, 13-23, with xii, 6; xxi; xxiv, 22; etc.

Digitized by Google

cult to discover any connection between chaps. xxvii and xxviii. Lastly, the seventh verse of chap. xxvii does not seem to be the natural continuation of what precedes, while the first verse of chap. xxix clearly marks off this chapter from the preceding, and the second verse of chap. xxix can be easily considered as a sequel to the sixth verse of chap. xxvii. From all this it is conjectured by many (1) that chap. xxvii, 7–23 is in its entirety, or at least in part, either a misplaced discourse of Sophar, who has no speech in the third cycle, differently from the other friends of Job, or a later addition; (2) that chap. xxviii is also a later addition, or perhaps an independent poem in praise of Wisdom, and inserted here to secure its preservation.

Despite these difficulties, the original character of chaps. xxvii, 7–xxviii is not entirely given up by Fr. Knabenbauer,[1] H. Lesêtre,[2] A. B. Davidson, Samuel Davidson,[3] Abbé Loisy,[4] K. Budde, C. H. Cornill,[5] etc. These scholars dispose of the alleged inconsistency between that section and the preceding and subsequent chapters in various ways. Job, it is claimed by some, is not made here to embrace an opinion of his friends that is contrary to his own previous statements, but he simply *relates* it somewhat at length, with a view to declare it *foolish*.[6] According to others, Job relates this view of his friends, and then uses it as an argument *ad hominem*, thus: As you know so well the fate of the sinner, take the warning to yourselves, for you are behaving wickedly. The connection between chaps. xxvii and xxviii is usually explained as a further illustration by Job in chap. xxviii of the mystery of God's

[1] Comm. in lib. Job.
[2] Job, in Lethielleux' Bible.
[3] Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii (London, 1862).
[4] Le Livre de Job, p. 13 sq.
[5] Einleitung in das A. Test., 4th edit. (Freiburg, 1896).
[6] Cfr. Job xxvii, 12.

Digitized by Google

ways already set forth in the foregoing chapters;[1] while the fact that the whole section (xxvii, 7–xxviii) does not seem to fit into its context may be accounted for by a partial dislocation which is the probable outcome of errors in transcription.[2]

The descriptions of Behemoth and Leviathan in Yahweh's second speech (xl, 10–xli, 25 in the Vulg.) have often been regarded as later additions, chiefly on the following grounds: (1) the description of these animals, if an original part of the poem, would have been in place in the first divine speech beside the other animal pictures as proving Yahweh's power; it is out of harmony with the idea of the second speech which deals with the problem of divine righteousness; (2) the same description lengthens uselessly the second speech, the natural conclusion of which is clearly in xl, 9; (3) the style is in several ways inferior to that in chaps. xxxviii–xxxix. To these objections Samuel Davidson has pertinently replied in the following manner:[3] "Here it is incorrectly assumed that the divine attributes of omnipotence and righteousness are treated apart in the two speeches of Jehovah. . . . This is not so. . . . The omnipotence of God is referred to in xl, 4–9, immediately after Job is challenged respecting his righteousness (verses 2 and 3). The difference of style merely shows the art of the poet in giving an appropriate form to each of his pictures. The style is not inferior at times to that of the best passages in the poem.[4] . . . Some connection, too, may be traced between xl, 9 and what follows. He that feels tempted to undertake the government of the world in the place of God, as if he could manage it better, must first be

[1] For other more or less satisfactory solutions of those difficulties, see A. B. DAVIDSON, DRIVER, LOISY, etc.

[2] Cfr. LOISY, loc. cit.

[3] Loc. cit., p. 204.

[4] This point is admitted by so able a Hebrew scholar as Prof. DRIVER, Introd. p 427.

Digitized by Google

sure that he is able to master and lead at his pleasure the monsters of the animal world. Can Job do this?"

The most questioned part of the entire work is xxxii–xxxvii, which contains the speeches of Eliu. These discourses are generally considered by critics and interpreters as not a part of the original poem, but rather as an addition intended to tone down the undue emphasis on certain aspects of truth which was felt in the speeches of Job and his friends. The principal arguments brought forward are briefly as follows: First, Eliu is not mentioned in either the Prologue or the Epilogue. And yet the Prologue names all the others who will share in the debate, and the Epilogue praises or blames, according to their deserts, all those who are supposed to have taken part in the controversy. In the second place, the Eliu speeches are not connected with the poem as a whole. Nobody has addressed Eliu before he begins to speak, and after his speeches nobody replies to him, so that his words, if removed, would not be missed. But further, they are a disturbing element in the poetical part. The opening words of Yahweh: "Who is this that wrappeth up sentences without knowledge?" addressed to Job without naming him (xxxviii, 2), naturally suggest that Job has just been speaking, and that he has not been silent while Eliu has proceeded with a long discourse. The Eliu speeches therefore interrupt the connection between Job's challenge in xxix–xxxi and Yahweh's apparently direct reply in xxxviii. Indeed they weaken the force of Yahweh's remarks by anticipating them at least in part. In the third place, the full and *verbatim* reproduction of Job's words at the beginning of several speeches of Eliu betrays a reader of the poem, rather than a listener to the debate. Fourthly, Eliu occupies substantially the same position as the three friends of Job, and especially Eliphaz, so that there is apparently no need

Digitized by Google

of a fourth speaker to set forth what has been already said. "And further, where Eliu differs from the friends it is rather in deeper reverence and a somewhat more advanced view of sin, both things betraying a later age and suggesting that the original book perplexed pious minds by its extraordinary boldness."[1] Lastly, the Eliu speeches are characterized by a language less vigorous and lucid than the rest of the poem, and they contain so many peculiarities of expression, and such a deep coloring of Aramaism, that it is only natural to refer them to an author distinct from the writer of the poetical part of the book of Job.[2]

To most of these objections answers of unequal value have been given by the advocates of the integrity of the poem. Indeed it is frankly admitted by A. B. Davidson, Prof. Driver, and others that the objections urged against the genuineness of the Eliu speeches have not been fully disposed of by the answers they have so far received It is hardly true to fact, for instance, to contend with the advocates of the genuineness that Eliu was worthy neither of the praise nor of the blame distinguished in the Epilogue: he wrongly held Job guilty in his words, and shared the blameworthy opinions of Job's friends on the most important points.[3] In answer to the second objection it has been said that were the Eliu speeches left out, the most important lesson of the poem would be done away with, viz., the disciplinary function of suffering. In reality this disciplinary function had been mentioned already by Eliphaz in chap. v. And further, this leaves intact the second part of the objection, viz., that the long speeches of Eliu look distinctly like a long interpolation between Job's challenge in chaps. xxix–xxxi and its apparently *immediate* answer by

[1] A. B. Davidson, the Book of Job, p. li sq.
[2] See K. Budde's admissions in this regard, quoted by Driver, p. 429, footn.
[3] Cfr. Abbé Le Hir, le Livre de Job. p. 367.

Digitized by Google

Yahweh in chap. xxxviii.[1] And it is a most significant fact that none of the advocates of the genuineness dares to meet this second part of the objection. The third difficulty, as stated above, has likewise been left without an adequate answer. Finally, the reasons usually given to account for the larger number of Aramaisms and other peculiarities of language and style in the speeches of Eliu, viz., that Eliu was an Aramæan from the tribe of Buz,[2] that he was a timid young man, and that the style, after the somewhat embarrassed opening of the discourse, is just what might be expected of an inexperienced speaker, etc., are hardly worthy of serious consideration, for, apart from the improbability that any of the speeches as they now stand were uttered by real personages, the other friends of Job were Aramæans probably just as much as Eliu; and the latter, in view of his manifest boldness of language, can hardly be called a timid young man, while his style, as distinctly stated by so competent a judge as Prof. Driver, "is such as to produce an impression upon the reader who peruses the entire group of speeches that is unmistakably different from that which any other six chapters of the book leave upon him."[3]

Yet some positive arguments have been presented in favor of the genuineness of the speeches of Eliu. First, it has been argued that, far from simply repeating those of Job's friends, or merely anticipating those of Yahweh, they truly correct the former and prepare the way for the latter, so that their position is very natural in the book of Job. In the second place, it is said that the close and natural

[1] Fr. VIGOUROUX (Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, No. 612) admits that "the speeches of Eliu seem to be less intimately connected than the rest with the body of the work"; and before him, Fr. LE HIR (loc cit., p. 366) wrote: "It must be confessed that the drama of Job would seem complete even though these [Eliu's] speeches would be removed from it"

[2] Cfr. Gen. xxii. 21.

[3] Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 429.

Digitized by Google

connection between Eliu's last speech and Yahweh's answer from the storm consists in this, that the rising thunder-cloud which Eliu describes is the very storm out of which Yahweh will soon speak. Lastly, "what is really the greatest difficulty in the way of considering these speeches a later insertion is just one of the facts which have been adduced to show that they are an insertion, namely, the opposition between them and the Prologue. If Eliu spoke like the three friends in ignorance of the Prologue and the cause of Job's calamities which it reveals, his position is natural. But if he was a reader of the book, the way in which he completely ignores the Prologue with its view of affliction and substitutes a theory radically different is extraordinary. In such a case his censure would extend to the whole cast of the book."[1]

Whatever may be thought of the actual value of these arguments, it is hardly probable that they will outweigh the difficulties stated above, and induce scholars generally to regard the speeches of Eliu as an original part of the book of Job.

2. Probable Purpose. It is easy to notice that in whatever way—gradual or otherwise—the main parts of the book of Job were put together, they all refer to one great subject, which, on account of the imperfection of the prevalent eschatological notions, was so perplexing a problem to the Jewish mind: the relation of suffering to sin.[2] Thus the Prologue suggests that suffering may be a trial for the sinless man. In the debate which follows, the friends of Job maintain that it is the punishment of the sinner, while he himself proclaims his innocence, and shows that suffering

[1] A. B. DAVIDSON, the Book of Job, p. li sq.

[2] Of course, scholars who regard Job as a gradual compilation from divers works or parts of works assign a special purpose to those various elements. See, for instance, art. Job in the Encyclop. Biblica.

Digitized by Google

and sin are not, in point of fact, connected either in his own case or in case of many others. Eliu covers pretty much the same ground as Job's friends, while Yahweh chiefly inculcates man's powerlessness to grapple with such a tremendous mystery as the existence of evil in the world. Finally, the Epilogue seems to show that for the truly just man trials and misfortunes will have an end even in this life.

It is because some scholars have failed to grasp this general idea to which, under one aspect or another, all the great divisions of the work refer, that so many theories have been put forth regarding the purpose of the book of Job, and that "almost every theory that has been adopted has found itself in collision with one or more parts of which the book now consists, and has been able to maintain itself only by sacrificing these parts upon its altar."[1] Among these unsatisfactory, because incomplete, views, the following may be mentioned: (1) the book of Job has for its purpose to inculcate true wisdom or the doctrine of unlimited acquiescence in the divine counsels and will[2] (cfr. xxviii, 28, and the general drift of Yahweh's speeches); (2) its aim is to teach the immortality of the soul (Michaelis; Ewald); (3) it is intended to controvert and discredit the dominant theory that all suffering proceeds from sin, that God's retributive justice is the *only* principle by which men are governed (Driver and others); (4) its design is to cast some light upon an acknowledged problem, viz., how the sufferings of the just in this world can be reconciled with God's righteousness (Hanneberg; Vigouroux; Kautzsch; etc.); (5) the author wished to comfort the much-tried Jewish nation, symbolized by the righteous Job, with the

[1] A. B. DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. xxiii.

[2] This is the view of many scholars, among whom may be mentioned Jno. JAHN, Samuel DAVIDSON, LOISY, etc.

Digitized by Google

thought that suffering was not a conclusive proof of its sinfulness, and the hope of final deliverance and greater prosperity than in the past.

§ 4. *Historical Character and Date of Composition.*

1. Historical Character of the Book of Job. The last theory just mentioned concerning the purpose of the book of Job goes far towards denying the historical character of that inspired writing. In describing the hero of the poem as simply a personification of the Jewish people, it practically does away with its historical basis, and sees little more in the book than the work of poetical imagination. Indeed, E. Reuss, A. Merx, and even Hengstenberg do not hesitate to represent the book as entirely imaginative. In so doing they share the view of some ancient Jewish rabbis which is embodied in the Talmud[1] to the effect that "Job existed not, and was not created, but he is [only] a parable." It is true that at a later date this passage was taken by Jewish scholars[2] to mean: "Job existed not, and was not created, except in order to be a parable' (or type), i.e., a model for the children of men. But the celebrated rabbi Moses Maimonides († 1204) understood the Talmudic passage in its obvious sense when he spoke of Job as a "parable meant to exhibit the views of mankind in regard to Providence."

The arguments usually set forth to show that Job is exclusively a work of the imagination are: (1) the manifestly supposed conversations between God and Satan, God and Job; (2) the wonderful literary form of the debate, the disputants being made to deliver profound theological and philosophical discourses in regular heptasyllabic verses; (3) the artificial regularity of the numbers descrip-

[1] Treatise Baba Bathra, fol. 15. in MAGNUS, Comm. z. B. Hiob p. 298.
[2] Among whom may be mentioned rabbis Hai, Rashi, and Eben Ezra,

Digitized by Google

tive of Job's possessions in the Prologue and the Epilogue (7 sons, 3 daughters, 7,000 sheep, 3,000 camels); (4) the advanced, and consequently late, character of the dogmatic truths with which the author represents Job and his friends thoroughly familiar, while the historical coloring is apparently borrowed from a much earlier age.[1]

Despite these and other such grounds for regarding the book of Job as a mere allegory, most scholars admit that Job is not simply a poetical invention. The Scriptural references to him in Ezechiel (xiv, 14) and in St. James (v, 11) seem to point to a real person well known in history, and thus his name has been reckoned among the saints venerated by the Church in the East and in the West.[2] The writer of the book in describing the moral character of Job, his riches, trials, etc., conveys the impression that he is dealing with at least a basis of actual history; and it is beyond doubt that the ancient Hebrew writers did not invent the personages of their poems. Furthermore, "as the author of Job comes forward clearly as a *teacher*, the ends which he had in view would be better secured if he set vividly before his people a history of which the outlines were popularly known than if he took as his hero one with whose name they were unfamiliar."[3]

But while contemporary critics and interpreters agree generally in admitting that the book of Job is not exclusively a work of the imagination, they are far from adhering to the ancient view of Jews and Christians which looked upon the entire work as thoroughly historical. They feel that Job, in its present form, is not purely and simply history. This they hold not only in connection with the de-

[1] Cfr. H. LESÊTRE. Introduction à l'Etude de l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 370 sq.

[2] The Eastern Church celebrates the feast of Job on the 6th, and the Western Church on the 10th, of May.

[3] DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p 412. See also A. B. DAVIDSON, the Book of Job, p. xviii sq.

Digitized by Google

bate between Job and his friends,—in which the thought, the highly wrought imagery, the poetical form, cannot possibly have been the extemporaneous utterances of four persons casually brought together,—but also in connection with the two celestial counsels spoken of in the Prologue; the symbolical numbers, three, five, and seven, used to describe Job's flocks and children; the statement that after his restoration the latter are exactly the same in number as before, while the former are exactly doubled; the lengthy speeches put into the mouth of Yahweh; etc. They are thus led to consider the book of Job as resting on a historical tradition which the author used and dramatized at his leisure, and in consequence they speak of it as "a drama,"[1] "a dramatic poem,"[2] etc., wherein the principal parts are in the form of a dialogue, and the plot passes through the successive stages of entanglement, development, and dénouement.

As might well be expected, it is impossible at the present day to disentangle the elements which belong to tradition from those which were added by the author.[3] It may be conjectured, however, that tradition told of Job as a man of exceptional piety and great wealth, who, suddenly bereaved of his children, health, and possessions, was at first fully resigned to God's holy will, but afterwards broke out into complaints against His providence, remained unsatisfied with the arguments of his friends, and was finally restored to his former health and prosperity. As regards the precise form under which these various data were circulated in the author's time nothing can be defined. Fr. Lesêtre[4] surmises that "they reached the author under

[1] VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique. vol. ii, No. 614.
[2] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 413.
[3] Cfr. H LESÊTRE, loc. cit., p. 372; DRIVER, loc. cit., p 412; etc.
[4] Introd. à l'Etude de l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 372.

Digitized by Google

the form of popular songs, traditional accounts, etc., widely spread in Arabia."

2. Date of Composition. The most obscure question concerning the book of Job is that which relates to its Author and Date of composition. Owing to its title, which is simply the name of its hero, many[1] have ascribed the authorship to Job himself; but both intrinsic and extrinsic data are against this too easy way of dealing with the problem;[2] and in consequence this view is now rejected by all critics. The opinion expressed in the Talmud and adopted by Cajetan, Bellarmin, Sanchez, etc., that Moses is the author of the book of Job, is likewise inadmissible. "The antique color of the book suggested to uncritical minds that it was an ancient composition, and such minds are always ready to ascribe an anonymous writing to some well-known name. Neither the Mosaic age, however, nor the times that followed it—times of stirring enterprise and warfare—were favorable for the production of a work of deep reflection such as Job."[3] The other great names put forth in this connection are those of Solomon, Isaias, Ezechias, Baruch, etc., "and who not? There are some minds that cannot put up with uncertainty, and are under the necessity of deluding themselves into quietude by fixing on some known name. There are others to whom it is a comfort to think that in this omniscient age a few things still remain mysterious. . . . No literature has so many great anonymous works as that of Israel."[4] The name of the author of Job is completely unknown.[5]

[1] St Ephrem; St. Gregory; Pineda; Lowth; etc.

[2] These data are well stated in Lesêtre's Introd., vol. ii, p. 365 sq.

[3] A. B. Davidson, in "Book by Book," p. 148. See also Lesêtre, loc. cit., p. 66; Cornely, Introductio, vol ii, part ii, p. 48.

[4] A. B. Davidson, Comm. on the Book of Job, p. lxviii.

[5] "In tanta opinionum de auctore libri Job varietate consultius est," says rightly Natalis Alexander, "nihil asserere, nisi incertum esse, a quo scriptus fuerit."

Digitized by Google

The date of composition of the book of Job is hardly less uncertain than the name of its author. It is indeed true that some prominent critics[1] have referred, and still refer, its composition to the Solomonic age, alleging chiefly the following reasons: (1) the highly elaborate and finished form of the poem, which, they say, bespeaks a period, such as that of Solomon, when lyric and gnomic poetry were cultivated in a high degree of excellence; (2) the questions regarding human life and the divine government of the world which are discussed in Job, and which had, it is claimed, arisen in Solomon's time; (3) the fact that the author of Job seems familiar with foreign countries and their products, and this familiarity with distant lands could have existed in the age of Solomon; (4) the points of contact in the book of Job and in the Proverbs of Solomon: sometimes in the ideas, such as the descriptions of Wisdom and the Sh^{e}ol; sometimes in words and expressions common to both, which indicate that they were composed at the same period; (5) the frequent allusions to passages in Job which have been detected in Isaias, Amos, Jeremias, Lamentations, and several Psalms. But it is none the less true that more numerous and no less able scholars[2] regard the book of Job as much later in date than the Solomonic age. From among the many arguments they appeal to,[3] the following deserve a special notice: (1) While the literary form and character of the poem point at least to the mature age of Hebrew literature, its strongly Aramaic language is

[1] WELTE; DANKO; KAULEN; VIGOUROUX; DELITZSCH; CORNELY; etc.

[2] GESENIUS; EWALD; Samuel DAVIDSON; A. B. DAVIDSON; DRIVER; LOISY; W. H. BENNETT; E. KAUTZSCH; etc.

[3] They are carefully set forth by DRIVER, Introd., p. 432 sqq.: W. T. DAVISON, art. Job, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 669 sqq. Prof. DRIVER justly calls attention to the fact that "the comparison of parallel passages in other books leads seldom to conclusive results, partly because the dates of the books referred to are often doubtful, partly from the frequent difficulty, even when the dates are clear, of determining on which side the dependence lies." (Cfr. H. LESÊTRE, Introduction, vol. ii, p. 367, no. 3.)

Digitized by Google

best accounted for by ascribing its composition to a later period, to a date more or less contemporary with the Deutero-Isaias (Isaias, chaps. xl-lxvi), which is usually referred to about the middle of the sixth century B.C. (2) The subject-matter of the book of Job is particularly conclusive for a late date. "The theme herein discussed and the manner of its discussion necessitate a long previous history. The problems of human life are doubtless old, but they could not be raised in the manner displayed in Job without a previous religious history, and one of considerable duration, in which the doctrine of the three friends had come to be the current and orthodox explanation of the facts of life. The history of the Old Testament shows that only at a comparatively late period were these maxims questioned; and when we find them not only questioned but discussed in the thorough manner of the book of Job, we may be sure that it was not composed till at least the closing period of the monarchy. Other features of religious doctrine—the doctrine of God, the way in which Satan is mentioned, and the spiritual doctrine of man, for example—point likewise to a comparatively late date."[1] (3) Many passages in the book of Job, such as iii, 20; vii, 6, 7; ix, 24; xxiv, 12; etc., point to a condition of great disorder and misery as the background of the poem, and totally different from Solomon's reign; and in particular xii, 17-25 seems to have in view "the great political changes wrought by the Assyrians or the Chaldæans among the principalities of Palestine and Syria (cfr. Isai. x, 7, 13 sq.)."[2]

Plainly these arguments are not without their respective force. But they are indecisive as regards the precise period —whether the age of Jeremias, during, shortly after, or

[1] W. T. DAVISON, art. Job, in HASTINGS, Dict., vol ii, p. 670. See also A. B DAVIDSON, the Book of Job, p. lxiii and DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 434.
[2] DRIVER, loc cit.

Digitized by Google

even long after the Babylonian Exile—to which the book of Job should be referred. And this uncertainty has no doubt contributed towards keeping up the theory, to all appearance started by Luther, that Job belonged to the Solomonic age.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER III.

THE PSALMS.

I. NAMES AND GENERAL CONTENTS:

1. Names: (תְּהִלִּים; ψαλμοί; ψαλτήριον).
2. Contents: General Object and Principal Classes of Psalms.

II. ORIGINAL TEXT AND PRINCIPAL VERSIONS:

1. Original Text:
   - Division into Five Books.
   - Substantial Integrity
2. Principal Ancient Versions:
   - Greek: the Septuagint (Origin; Characteristics; Importance).
   - Latin: the Vulgate (History; Principal Features; Authority).

III. NUMBERING AND TITLES OF THE PSALMS:

1. Numbering in
   - the Hebrew Text and the Protestant Versions.
   - the Septuagint and the Vulgate.
2. Titles:
   - Their Antiquity and Various Kinds.
   - Their Value.

IV. GRADUAL FORMATION OF THE PSALTER:

1. Principal Difficulties concerning the Question.
2. Leading Facts Stated and Examined.
3. Authorship and Date of
   - the Davidic Collections (Book I, Pss. l–lxxi of Book II).
   - the Completion of the Whole Psalter (the Machabean Psalms).

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III.

THE PSALMS.

§ 1. *Names and General Contents.*

1. Names. In the ordinary printed editions of the Hebrew Text the Psalms head the list of the Hagiographa, under the name of תְּהִלִּים, Tehillîm,[1] literally "praise-songs." This name is not applicable to all the Psalms, many of which have a different object from that of praising God; and it is worthy of notice that only one Psalm (Ps. cxliv, Heb. cxlv) bears the title "A Praise." But it was most likely given to the whole collection, because the book was the manual of the Temple service of song in which praise was considered as the predominant element. Indeed such an application seems fully justified when one bears in mind the fact that *Tehillîm* is derived from a word (Halal) used in the technical language of the Temple services to designate the execution of jubilant song of praise to the accompaniment of musical instruments.[2]

In the Vatican MS. of the Septuagint the whole book is called ψαλμοί, that is canticles sung with the accompaniment of a stringed instrument;[3] while in the Alexandrine MS. of the same Version it is styled ψαλτήριον, a word

[1] This word occurs in the Old Test. only in the feminine forms Tehi lah, Tehilloth (cfr Exod. xv, 11; Pss. xxii, 4; lxxviii, 4, etc.). Cfr. B. Davidson, Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures, p. 252 (London. Bagster, 1876). A portion of the Church's public services is called in the Roman breviary *Laudes*, i.e., praises.

[2] Cfr. I Paralip. xvi, 4 sqq; xxv, 3; etc.

[3] The Septuagint used the word ψαλμός to render the Hebrew word *Mizmor*.

Digitized by Google

which meant originally a stringed instrument, a *psaltery*, and was afterwards used commonly to designate a collection of Psalms, a *psalter*. The collective names "Book of Psalms" and "Psalms" found in the New Testament[1] are derived directly from the Septuagint, from which they also passed into the Vulgate, and so came into general use in the Christian Church.

2. General Contents. It is no easy matter to describe the general object of the sacred hymns which make up the book of Psalms. Nor is it less difficult to set forth a classification which will sufficiently take into account their respective contents. In fact most Biblical scholars either do not attempt to point out the general object of the Psalter, or describe it only in a vague and general manner. When more than this is attempted it leads to subtle and arbitrary distinctions in defining the various classes of Psalms. For these reasons we simply give Prof. Driver's account of the general contents and principal classes of Psalms, which seems on the whole satisfactory. "The Psalms, speaking generally, consist of reflections, cast into a poetical form, upon the various aspects in which God manifests Himself either in nature, or towards Israel or the individual soul, accompanied often—or, indeed, usually—by an outpouring of the emotions and affections of the Psalmist, prompted by the warmth of his devotion to God, though varying naturally in character, according to the circumstances in which he is placed. Thus in some Psalms the tone is that of praise or thanksgiving; in others it is one of penitence or supplication; in others, again, it is meditative or didactic; not infrequently also a Psalm is of mixed character; it begins, perhaps, in a strain of supplication, and as the poet proceeds the confidence that his prayer will be answered grows upon

[1] Luke xx, 42; xxiv, 44; Acts i, 20.

Digitized by Google

him, and he ends in a tone of jubilant exultation (for instance, Pss. vi; xii, xxi, see verse 22 sqq.; xxv; xxx; xxxv; lxiii; lxviii; lxx). In the Psalter the *devotional* element of the religious character finds its completest expression; and the soul is displayed in converse with God, disclosing to Him its manifold emotions, desires, aspirations, or fears. It is the surprising variety of mood and subject and occasion in the Psalms which gives them their catholicity, and, combined with their deep spirituality, adapts them to be the hymn-book, not only of the second Temple, but of the Christian Church.

"Individual Psalms often present a mixed character, so that it is difficult to classify them in accordance with their subject-matter; but the following outline of the subjects which they embrace may be useful (comp. Hupfeld, die Psalmen, pp. vii–ix): (1) Meditations on different aspects of God's providence as manifested in creation, history, etc.: Ps. viii (man, how small, and yet how great!); xviii, 1–7 (God's glory in the heavens); xxviii (Jehovah's majesty seen in the thunder-storm); xxxii; xxxv; lxiv (a harvest Psalm); cii (the mercifulness of God); ciii (the poem of Creation); cvi; cxliv–cxlvi; and with invocations of a liturgical character, xxiii, 7–10; xlvi; lxvi; xciv–xcix; cx; cxii; cxiii (2d part); cxvi; cxxxiii–cxxxv; cxlviii–cl.

(2) Reflections on God's moral government of the world: Pss. i; xxxiii; lxxiv; lxxvi; lxxxix; xci; cxi; and of a directly didactic character, Pss. xxxvi; xlviii; lxxii; or on the character and conduct that is pleasing in His eyes, Pss. xiv; xxiii, 1–6; xxxi; xxxix, 1–13; xlix.

(3) Psalms expressive of faith, resignation, joy in God's presence, etc.: Pss. x; xv; xxii; xxv; xxvi; xli sq.; lxi; lxii; lxxxiii; xc; cxx; cxxvi; cxxvii; cxxix; cxxx; cxxxii; cxxxviii (the sense of God's omnipresence); praise of the law, Pss. xviii, 8–15; cxviii.

Digitized by Google

(4) Psalms with a more distinct reference to the circumstances of the Psalmist (including sometimes his companions or coreligionists), viz.: (*a*) petitions for help in sickness, persecution or other trouble, or for forgiveness of sins (often accompanied with the assurance that the prayer will be answered): Pss. iii–vii; ix sq.; xi; xii; xvi; xxi, and many besides; (*b*) thanksgivings, Pss. xxix; xxxix, 1–12; cxiv; cxxxvii.

(5) *National* Psalms: consisting of (*a*) complaints of national oppression or disaster: Pss. xiii (= lii); xliii; lix; lxxiii and lxxviii (desolation of the sanctuary); lxxix; lxxxi; lxxxii; lxxxiv; xciii; ci; cvii; cxxii; cxxxvi; (*b*) thanksgivings for mercies either already received or promised for the future: Pss. xlv; xlvi; xlvii; lxv; lxvii; lxxv; lxxxvi (Sion, the future spiritual metropolis of the world); cxvii; cxxi (prayer for the welfare of Jerusalem); cxxiii–cxxv; cxxviii; cxliii, 12–15.

(6) The *historical* Psalms, being retrospects of the national history with reference to the lessons deducible from it: Pss. lxxvii; lxxx; civ; cv; cxiii.

(7) Psalms relating to the king (*royal* Psalms), being thanksgivings, good wishes, or promises, especially for the extension of his dominion: Pss. ii; xvii; xix; xx; xliv (on the occasion of a royal wedding); lxxi; lxxxviii (a supplication on account of the humbled dynasty of David); c (a king's rule of life); cix; cxxxi; cfr. xxvii; lx; lxii. These Psalms have often a Messianic import.

The line separating (4) and (5) is not always clearly drawn."[1]

[1] DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 368 sq. See also Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 438 sq. For more systematic classifications, see H. LESÊTRE, le Livre des Psaumes, p. lviii sqq.; VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 656; Elie PHILIPPE, Introd. au Livre des Psaumes, p. 35 sqq.; etc. The *Messianic* aspect of the Psalter is well treated by the scholars just named, and also by A. F. KIRKPATRICK, The Book of Psalms, vol. i, p. lviii sqq.

Digitized by Google

§ 2. *Original Text and Principal Versions.*

1. Original Text. The Psalter has from ancient times been divided into five books. This division is indicated in the Massoretic Text by distinct headings which have been introduced into the English Revised Version of 1885 and into the edition of the Latin Vulgate published by Father Fillion in 1887.[1] Besides, at the close of the first four books there is a doxology, which, having, as a rule, no connection with the Psalm to which it is appended, obviously marks the end of a collection. It is true that no special doxology is added to the fifth book; but it is apparently because the last Psalm is considered as an appropriate concluding doxology for the whole Psalter. This fivefold division will be better realized by means of the following table:

Book.	Contents.	Doxology.
I.	Pss. i–xl.[2]	Ps. xl, 14: Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Israel, From everlasting and to everlasting! Amen and Amen!
II.	Pss. xli–lxxi.	Ps. lxxi, 18, 19: Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Israel, Who alone doth wonderful things! And blessed be His glorious Name for ever! And let the whole earth be filled with His glory! Amen and Amen![3]
III.	Pss. lxxii–lxxxviii.	Ps. lxxxviii 53: Blessed be Yahweh for evermore! Amen and Amen!
IV.	Pss. lxxxix–cv.	Ps. cv, 48: Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Israel, From everlasting to everlasting! *And let all the people say:* Amen. Alleluia!
V.	Pss. cvi–cl.	Ps. cl.

[1] In preparing this edition, Father Fillion enjoyed the valuable co-operation of Rev. Jos. BRUNEAU, S.S., D.D. (Cfr. p. ix of Fillion's Bible (1st ed.)

[2] The numeration of Psalms and verses given here is that of the Vulgate.

[3] To this doxology is added the important remark: "the prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended" (Ps. lxxi, 20).

Digitized by Google

Several early Church writers were acquainted with this peculiarity of the original text,[1] but they did not all take the same view of it. Some regarded the fivefold division of the Psalter as perfectly admissible, and did admit it as resting on an ancient Jewish tradition. Others, on the contrary, discarded it as in opposition to the authority of St. Peter, who, in Acts i, 20, speaks of "*the book* of Psalms." At the present day all scholars, fully aware that the prince of the Apostles simply used the common language of his time without reference to a question of literary criticism, have no difficulty in attaching much importance to a division which must be earlier than the Septuagint, since that ancient Greek Version has the doxologies in the very same places as the Hebrew Text. They disagree only with regard to the principle according to which the fivefold division of the Psalter was made. "This principle has been variously stated as an analogy to the five books of Moses, as a chronological order, as an arrangement by authors, by contents, for liturgical purposes, etc."[2] In reality, all attempts to account for the present division of the Psalter by appealing to one single controlling principle are the outcome of *a priori* conceptions, rather than of a careful inquiry into the actual arrangement of the book. As might well be expected, many causes contributed to bring it into its present form, and their number, together with their respective influence, will become apparent later on when we examine the important question of the origin and growth of the book of Psalms.

But whatever may have been the causes to which this fivefold division of the original text is due, it is beyond doubt that the headings themselves, "book i," "book ii," etc., are not an integrant part of the Psalter itself. They are justly considered as belonging to the later additions

[1] Cfr. J. J. Stewart PEROWNE, the Book of Psalms, p. 72 sq. (7th ed.); H. LESÊTRE, le Livre des Psaumes, p. xlii.

[2] Ph. SCHAFF, Bible Dictionary, p. 710.

Digitized by Google

which, with other modifications, the original text of the Psalms naturally received in the course of ages, and to an extent little suspected by the ordinary reader of those sacred hymns. From among such various alterations we shall simply mention the following:

(1) Additions made *to the end* of certain Psalms in order to adapt them to circumstances of a later period, which were somewhat similar, but yet not quite parallel. Of this description are probably the last two verses of Ps. l, which did not form part of the original Psalm, but were added to it by the Exiles, who adapted it to their own needs.[1] A similar case occurs in Ps. xxiv, 22; Ps. xiii, 7;[2] and probably also in Ps. lxviii, 36, 37.

(2) Alterations *in the body* of a Psalm with a view also to apply it to other and later circumstances. These alterations are more closely blended with the context than the additions simply appended to a Psalm, so that they cannot be so easily recognized. This is apparently the case with Ps. lii, which agrees for the most part verbally with Ps. xiii, but yet differs in one passage (verse 6) in a manner which can be explained only under the supposition that the Psalm in its original state in Ps. xiii was subsequently applied to other circumstances, and therefore modified into the form which Ps. lii exhibits.

(3) "In other places a portion only of some more ancient and longer hymn has been appropriated at a later time, perhaps for liturgical use, as Ps. lxix = Ps. xxxix, 14–18; or two songs or parts of several songs have been united into one. Thus Ps. cvii is made up from Ps. lvi, 8–12 and Ps. lix, 7–14. . . . Ps. xviii consists of two sections (1–7; 8–15), which, both in purport and form, are quite distinct from each other."[3]

[1] Cfr. A. F. Kirkpatrick, the Book of Psalms, vol. ii, p. 285 sqq.

[2] Cfr. Vigouroux, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 686.

[3] Friedrich Bleek, An Introduction to the Old Test., vol. ii, § 277, p. 249 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

(4) Besides changes intentionally made to adapt certain Psalms to later use, many accidental alterations inevitably crept into the original text of the Psalter during the long process of transcription by means of which it has come down to us. Critical commentaries abound in references to such unintentional changes, more or less important. The greater number of the alterations thus pointed out are fully ascertained either by comparing the original text, where it is obscure or apparently defective, with the ancient Versions, more particularly the Septuagint; or by examining the text of one and the same Psalm when it is repeated in two different books of the Psalter; or by comparing the recension of a song in the Psalter with another recension in some other inspired writing of the Bible;[1] or, again, by testing the integrity of an alphabetical Psalm to see whether all the letters of the Hebrew alphabet follow in the text in regular order, as they certainly did at the time when the Psalm was composed;[2] etc.

(5) Lastly, in some few cases, there is reason to suspect corruption, intentional or accidental, but anterior to all extant documentary authorities, and it is sometimes possible to re establish the original reading by means of conjectural emendation.[3]

Whoever takes into account all these alterations of the original text may well be tempted to consider it as of but little value for critical purposes. And yet these alterations are neither more numerous nor more important than one might naturally expect in hymns so long preserved, so often transcribed by all manner of copyists. Yea, more: despite all its defects, the Hebrew Psalter has not only preserved

[1] This is the case for instance, with David's song of victory, Ps xvii, which also occurs in II Kings xxii.

[2] This test when applied to the alphabetical Ps. cxliv shows that the distich beginning with the letter נ is missing in the Hebrew, although still found in the Vulgate and the Septuagint.

[3] This is apparently the case with the opening verses of Ps xv (cfr. T. K. CHEYNE, the Book of Psalms p 174; H. LESÊTRE, le Livre des Psaumes, p 58 sqq; etc).

Digitized by Google

what is commonly called its substantial integrity, but also remains as a whole undoubtedly superior to any of the ancient Versions for the purpose of critical and exegetical study, while these Versions may in turn prove useful for detecting and correcting the defects of the Massoretic Text.

2. Principal Ancient Versions. Foremost with respect to antiquity and importance among these ancient Versions ranks the Septuagint translation of the Psalter. The exact date and the other circumstances of its origin are unknown. It is generally assumed that when the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach, about 132 B.C., speaks not only of *the Law* and *the Prophets*, but also of *the other books*, as differing much in the Greek from the Hebrew original, he has in view the Septuagint translation of the *Hagiographa*, and consequently of the Psalter.[1] But even when this position is taken for granted, the obscurity which surrounds the origin of the Septuagint Version of the Psalms is by no means removed. No light is thereby cast on the precise date when this translation was made, nor on its authors and their purpose and methods in rendering the Hebrew hymnal into Greek. It has indeed been argued by many that, owing to the need which the Alexandrian Jews would naturally feel to have a Greek Psalter for their public services, the book of Psalms must have been rendered into Greek soon after the Law had been translated, i.e. soon after 280 B.C. If in reality the Septuagint translation of the Psalms owes its origin to such a desire on the part of the Egyptian Jews, it is highly probable that only those of the Psalms which were then employed for liturgical purposes would be at first rendered into the vernacular, while the translation of the others would be postponed to a somewhat later, and now unknown, date.

[1] Cfr. Prologue to Ecclesiasticus.

Digitized by Google

However this may be, it is beyond doubt that the Greek translation of the Psalms was made from a text consisting only of consonants, which were, moreover, here and there somewhat indistinct. This Hebrew Text contained also a certain number of glosses, and had not yet been fixed in that definite form which is now known as the Massoretic. The translators rendered it usually in a literal manner, and oftentimes—especially in difficult passages—without apprehending its meaning. In consequence their work, which is generally considered as "on the whole fairly good,"[1] is marred by too close renderings of Hebrew idioms connected with almost all the parts of Hebrew grammar: nouns (cases, numbers, genders), pronouns, adverbs, etc. Their manner of translating the tenses of verbs—which exhibit such marked differences in the Hebrew and the Greek—is particularly defective. At times, too, they supplied the Hebrew consonants with different vowel sounds from those found in our Hebrew Textus Receptus, and even made mistakes concerning the letters in the manuscript before them. It is clear, also, that in making their Greek version of the Psalter they deliberately softened down the anthropomorphic expressions of the original text. Thus instead of calling God a rock, a fortress, a shield, etc., as is done in the original Hebrew, they speak of Him as the strength, the defence, the protection, etc., of the Psalmist or of Israel. Finally, they usually misunderstood the technical terms found in the Hebrew Psalter, especially the names of musical instruments, indications of tunes, etc.[2]

These are some of the defective features which the Septuagint translation of the book of Psalms exhibited from the first, and which can still be recognized "notwithstanding the swarm of various readings contained in its

[1] A. F. Kirkpatrick, the Book of Psalms, Introduct., p. lii.
[2] Cfr. Abbé H. Lesêtre, le Livre des Psaumes (Lethielleux' Bible), p. lxxxv.

Digitized by Google

MSS."[1] All such defects, together with the various readings which gradually crept into the text of this ancient translation, should indeed prevent us from using indiscriminately the Greek Psalter for the various purposes of criticism and exegesis. But they should not betray us into regarding its text as useless for such purposes. The Septuagint Version was made from a Hebrew Text older than the one now embodied in our Hebrew Bibles, and points many a time, on that account, to readings preferable to those exhibited by the Massoretic Text. Even when it agrees with the readings found in our Hebrew Psalter, it is not without importance, inasmuch as it proves their antiquity and confirms their correctness. Indeed, the very defect noticed above, viz., that it renders too closely the original Hebrew, is not without some advantage for the purpose of textual criticism, since this closeness enables modern scholars all the more readily and securely to ascertain the Hebrew words which the translators had in their own copy of the original text.

Further proofs of the great importance of this Version of the Psalter are found in the following facts: (1) of the 283 direct quotations from the Old Testament in the New, no less than 116 are taken from the book of Psalms as rendered by the Septuagint translators;[2] (2) it is this Version that the Fathers of the Eastern Church studied for their private use and commented upon in their public homilies, and that was indirectly used by those of the Western Church, inasmuch as the Old Latin Version was made, and indeed very closely, from the Greek Psalter; (3) it is this

[1] Franz DELITZSCH, Comm. on the Book of Psalms, vol. i, p. 50 (New York, Funk and Wagnalls). The principal MSS. of the Septuagint have been already pointed out in the "General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer. See also H. B. SWETE's edition of the LXX, and Introduction to the Old Test. in Greek, part i, chap. v, and part iii, chap vi.

[2] Cfr. the Speaker's Bible, on the Psalms, p 146.

Digitized by Google

same Version which is practically embodied in the Vulgate which contains, not the translation of St. Jerome, but a revision made by him of the Old Latin by means of the Hexaplar Text of the Greek Psalter;[1] (4) even the English translation of the Psalter which is used in the liturgy of the Church of England was not made directly from the Hebrew Text, but "out of the Douche and Latyn," i.e. from the Swiss-German Version, known as the Zurich Bible, and from the Vulgate, so that "many of its peculiar renderings, and in particular the additions which it contains, are derived from the LXX through the Vulgate";[2] finally, the Septuagint Version of the book of Psalms remains, down to the present day, the official Psalter of the Greek Church.

Another ancient Version of the Psalms worthy of special notice is the translation embodied in the Latin Vulgate. It was made in the early days of Christianity, when the liturgical and homiletical needs of the Latin Church demanded a translation of the Old Testament into the vernacular. The precise date of its origin is unknown, but from its first appearance it naturally formed an integrant part of the Old Latin Version of Holy Writ—one or manifold—which is often spoken of as the *Vetus Itala*.[3] The Psalter—as indeed the rest of this ancient Version of the Old Testament—was made directly, not from the Hebrew Text, then regarded as the Bible of the Jews, but from the Septuagint, which had been chiefly used by the New Testament writers, and had till then been considered as the official text of the Christian Church, both in the East and in the West. As time went on, the Latin Psalter lost more and more of its primitive correctness and uniformity through the ignorance or carelessness of transcribers, so

[1] Concerning this Hexaplar Text of the LXX, see "General Introduction," p. 278 sq.

[2] A. F. KIRKPATRICK, the Book of Psalms, Introduction, p. lvi.

[3] In regard to the unity or plurality of the *Old Latin Version*, see "General Introduction," by the present writer, pp. 307-312.

Digitized by Google

that in the last quarter of the fourth century of our era a revision of its text had become a practical necessity. Then it was that Pope St. Damasus († 384), an admirer and friend of St. Jerome, called upon that great Biblical scholar to undertake the work of revision. Conscious of the many difficulties which surrounded his attempt at revising a text so constantly used in the sacred liturgy and so familiar to the faithful at large, St Jerome went back to the current Greek Text of the Septuagint Psalter from which the Psalms had been primitively rendered into Latin, and modified but little the Latin Psalter of the time. He made this revision at Rome, in 383, "rather hastily" (*cursim*), as he puts it, and without thoroughness, lest by introducing too many changes he should hurt the feelings of the faithful who knew the Psalter by heart, "ne nimia novitate lectoris studium terreremus." This first revision, introduced by St. Damasus into the Roman liturgy, and still in use in the Church of St. Peter, in Rome, is known as the *Psalterium Romanum.*[1]

As might naturally be expected, copyists familiar with the readings of the unrevised Latin book of Psalms either refused to adopt the changes introduced by St. Jerome and came back to the previous readings, or unwittingly mixed the words of the *Vetus Itala* with those of the revised version, so that after a few years of such defective transcription the Latin Psalter sorely needed to be revised again. A second revision was therefore undertaken by St. Jerome, who by this time had settled down in Bethlehem. He worked at it with greater care than he had done for the first revision, using for this purpose the Greek Text of the LXX as found in the Hexapla of Origen, and preserving in his

[1] To this *Psalterium Romanum* belongs the Ps. xciv which is read in the Breviary for the daily office at Matins. The passages borrowed from the Psalms which are found in the Roman Missal are also taken from the *Psalterium Romanum*.

Digitized by Google

own work the critical signs of the Hexaplar Psalter.[1] This second revision (about 389 A.D.), which the churches of Gaul were the first to adopt, received the name of *Psalterium Gallicanum.*[2] It is substantially the Psalter embodied in our Latin Vulgate and in the Roman Breviary; for, although the same illustrious Doctor soon afterwards translated the Psalms directly from the Hebrew, this third Psalter—the *Psalterium ex Habræo*, as it is called,—despite its great critical and exegetical importance, never came into general use.[3]

Thus, then, the Psalter as it exists in our Latin Vulgate is not a direct translation from the original Hebrew, but only a revision, and indeed the second revision, of the Old Latin Psalter, which was itself closely made from the Septuagint Version. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that it bears as a characteristic feature the impress of its complex origin. Like the Septuagint Version from which it was originally derived and by means of which it was twice revised, it contains Hebrew idioms too closely translated,[4] and in particular defective renderings of the Hebrew tenses,[5] together with obscure expressions due to the imperfect understanding by the Septuagint translators of the musical and other technical terms in the original Hebrew. Like the Old Latin Psalter primitively made for popular use, it exhibits words and constructions which be-

[1] The purpose of Origen's critical signs has been pointed out in the "General Introduction," p 279.

[2] Both Psalters, the "Roman" and the "Gallican," are given in parallel columns in MIGNE. Patr Lat. vol xxix, col. 119 sqq.

[3] St. Jerome's "Psalterium ex Hebræo" is found in MIGNE, Patr Lat., vol. xxviii, col. 1127 sqq. It enables us to realize St. Jerome's own view concerning the meaning of passages of dogmatic import, and proves that the Hebrew Text employed by him differed but little from the Massoretic.

[4] Of this description are the following expressions: *virum sanguinum* (Ps. v, 7); *aqua refectionis* (Ps. xxii, 2); *Deus justitiæ meæ* (Ps. iv, 2); *conventicula de sanguinibus* (Ps. xv, 4); etc. etc

[5] This is well explained by F. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique vol ii, no. 667.

Digitized by Google

long, not to the Latin of Cicero and other classical writers, but to the *lingua rustica* of the period in which it originated.[1] Like the Old Latin Psalter, too, which was made closely from the Greek Text, it presents many Greek idioms very literally rendered, and indeed Greek words simply supplied with Latin endings.[2] So that in these and other such respects it is clearly inferior to the "*Psalterium ex Hebræo*," or St. Jerome's direct translation from the original Hebrew. It remains true, however, that the Latin Psalter found in the Vulgate is in many instances remarkable for its precision and clearness of expression. Its renderings are in the main correct, and there is no doubt that it reproduces the general substance of the original Hebrew Psalter. Most of its divergencies from the Hebrew are seldom of any dogmatic or moral importance.[3] Be that as it may, we always remain at liberty to utilize the Hebrew Text or the Septuagint Version to improve our Latin Psalter in various particulars,[4] as has been done by Lesêtre, Fillion, and quite recently by Father M'Swiney, S.J.[5]

[1] Such words and expressions as *verba præcipitationis* (Ps. li, 6); *resurgent in judicio* (Ps. i, 5); *mortificare* (as meaning *occidere* in Ps. xxxvi, 32); etc., belong to the *lingua rustica* (see VAN STEENKISTE, in Psalmos, vol. iii, p. 121 sq.; Card. WISEMAN, Essays, vol. i).

[2] Thus *in excelso loqui* is a literal rendering of εἰς τὸ ὕψος (Ps. lxxii, 8); in Ps. lxviii, 13 we find the absolute accusative after the Greek fashion by the ellipsis of κατά. Again, cases and genders are oftentimes kept as they were in the Greek—*Judica nocentes me*, for instance, instead of *nocentes mihi*. From among the Greek words with Latin endings, we may mention the words *synagoga* (Ps. vii, 8); *christos* (Ps. civ, 15; etc. Cfr. VAN STEENKISTE, loc. cit., p. 119 sq.

[3] In regard to the dogmatic import of the difference in Ps. cix, 3, between our Vulgate and the Hebrew Text, see more particularly CORLUY, S.J., Spicilegium dogmatico biblicum, vol. ii, p. 189 sq.; Abbé FILLION, les Psaumes commentés, p. 519 sq.; etc.

[4] Cfr the remarkable words of St. Jerome in his Epistle to Sunnia et Fretela, in MIGNE, Patr. Lat., vol. xxii, col. 853. In regard to the ancient Versions known as the Targum and the Peshitto, see DELITZSCH, Comm. on the Psalms, p. 52 sqq.; H. LESÊTRE, les Psaumes, p. lxxxvii; A. F. KIRKPATRICK, the Book of Psalms, Introd., p. liii sq.; etc.

[5] Translation of the Psalms and Canticles.

Digitized by Google

§ 3. *The Numbering and Titles of the Psalms.*

1. Numbering of the Psalms. Both the Massoretic Text and the ancient Versions just spoken of reckon a total of 150 Psalms;[1] but although they agree in the total, they differ somewhat in the manner of computation. The LXX—followed by the Vulgate—unites Pss. ix and x (which originally formed but one Psalm, as the alphabetical arrangement shows), and also Pss. cxiv and cxv, while it divides Pss. cxvi and cxlvii. The following table exhibits clearly these differences of computation:

Hebrew (and Modern Protestant Versions).		LXX (Vulgate and ancient English Bibles).
Pss. i–viii.	=	Pss. i–viii.
ix, x.	=	ix.
xi–cxiii.	=	x–cxii.
cxiv, cxv.	=	cxiii.
cxvi.	=	cxiv–cxv.
cxvii–cxlvi.	=	cxvi–cxlv.
cxlvii.	=	cxlvi, cxlvii.
cxlviii–cl.	=	cxlviii–cl.

2. Titles of the Psalms. Most of the Psalms in the Hebrew Text are supplied with titles or inscriptions the high antiquity of which is proved by the fact that they were known to the Septuagint translators. These titles are of various kinds. Some apparently describe the character of the poem, such, for instance, as *Mizmor* (rendered *Psalm*), *Shir* (*canticle* or *song*), *Maschil*, *Michtam*, etc. Others are connected with the musical setting or performance, as the title "to the chief musician" (rendered in the Vulgate by *in finem*) which is prefixed to fifty-five Psalms; or "on n^{e}ginôth" (on stringed instruments); "upon n^{e}hilôth" (on wind instruments); etc. A few others refer to the liturgical

[1] The 151st Psalm, which is added in the LXX. is expressly said by that Version to be "outside the number." Concerning this spurious composition, see "General Introduction," by the present writer, p. 127

Digitized by Google

use of the Psalm. Thus Ps. xcii (xci in the Vulg.) is entitled "Mizmor, a song for the Sabbath-day";[1] Ps. xxx (in the Vulg. xxix) has for its heading "Mizmor, a song at the Dedication of the House"; etc. Other titles relate to authorship: thus one Psalm (Ps. lxxxix) is ascribed to Moses "the man of God" (Deuter. xxxiii, 1); seventy-three Psalms bear the name of David; two, that of Solomon; twelve, that of Asaph, one of David's chief musicians; eleven are referred to the sons of Core; and one to each of the celebrated wise men, Heman, and Ethan the Ezrahite. Finally, titles describing the occasion of the Psalm are prefixed to thirteen Psalms, all of which bear the name of David. They connect those sacred hymns—"in terms borrowed generally, though not always, and sometimes with slight variations in detail, from the historical books—with events in the life of David,"[2] most being referred to the period of his persecution by Saul; two, to his flight from before Absalon; one, to the Syro-Ammonite war; and one, to his fall.

The titles found in the Hebrew Text are usually faithfully rendered in the Septuagint and the Vulgate. But besides, the former Version contains many additional ones. Thus it ascribes to David Pss. xxxii, xlii, lxvi, lxx, xcii, xcviii, ciii, which are anonymous in the original Hebrew;[3] it has notices of the days on which several Psalms (viz., Pss. xxiii, xlvii, xcii, xciii) were sung in public services;[4] etc. As regards the Vulgate, it exhibits the titles found in both the Hebrew Text and the Septuagint Version, and moreover refers to Aggeus and Zachary the authorship of Ps. cxi.

[1] In the time of the Second Temple, each day of the week has its special Psalm destined to be sung during the drink-offering which accompanied the morning holocaust, and the title to Ps. xcii describes it as the special Psalm to be sung on the Sabbath-day.

[2] DRIVER, Introd. to the Literature of the Old Test., p. 370.

[3] In the Alexandrine Codex Ps. lxi is also ascribed to David; as also in a few MSS. Pss. i and ii.

[4] The Old Latin Version refers Ps. lxxx to the fifth day of the week (A. F. KIRKPATRICK, the Book of Psalms, Introduction, p. xxiv).

Digitized by Google

It is plain that if these various titles are from the Psalmists, or from inspired editors, they must be regarded as enjoying the same authority as the rest of the sacred Text. As a matter of fact, many Fathers of the Church, and the old commentators generally, have considered them as genuine, and attributed to them the greatest value, explaining them with as much diligence as the Psalms themselves. Nevertheless it is significant that the Church never ordered that they should be sung in her services, and never defined their canonical character. In modern times, some scholars have treated them all as spurious and worthless,[1] while most authors, less venturesome in matters of criticism, prefer neither to reject those titles bodily nor to follow them implicitly, but simply to abide by them when there is good reason to do so.[2]

The principal arguments usually set forth in favor of the genuineness of the titles are: " (1) the practice of the Hebrew and Arabian poets to prefix their names to their songs;[3] (2) the fact that the Psalms are not all provided with titles, and that these titles are of variable length and present the greatest variety of form and matter. (3) It is admitted that those notices which relate to the musical execution had already become unintelligible in the age succeeding the Exile;[4] moreover, they are found in none of the Psalms of manifestly late date, but only in those ascribed to David and his singers. As regards the rest of the notices, concerning the character of the Psalm, its author, its historical occasion, or its primary object, they have these two proofs of their genuineness and originality: on the one hand, they

[1] This has been done by VOGEL, DE WETTE, EWALD, OLSHAUSEN, HUPFELD, and quite lately by T. K. CHEYNE; etc.

[2] This is the position adopted by H. LESÊTRE, VIGOUROUX, FILLION, Jas. M'SWINEY, S J., A. F. KIRKPATRICK, etc., etc.

[3] Cfr. II Sam. xxiii, 1; Isai. xxxviii, 9; Habacuc iii, 1; etc.

[4] It is quite certain that the Septuagint translators were unable to understand even their general purport.

Digitized by Google

are often confirmed by the historical books, and yet they have not been drawn from these sources by mere conjecture; on the other hand, it is affirmed "that they coincide perfectly with the contents of the Psalms; that they contain not a single statement which can be shown to be untrue, and they have been proclaimed to be incorrect and unsuitable only on account of erroneous dogmatic, æsthetic, and critical prejudices."[1]

To these arguments the opponents of the genuineness of many if not all of the titles of the Psalms reply (1) that the variations found in MSS. and Versions tend to show that, from ancient times, those titles were not regarded as an integral part of the text, but were liable to alteration by the transcribers, like the titles of the books of the New Testament; (2) that we have no proofs that the notices relating to musical execution were unintelligible to the age immediately succeeding the Exile, and that the fact that the Septuagint at a much later date made no sense out of them may be accounted for by the remoteness of the Alexandrian translators from Jerusalem and its Temple worship, without appealing to the very high antiquity, still less to the genuineness, of such titles; (3) that the fact that only Moses, David, Solomon, and David's singers are mentioned in the Hebrew titles which refer to authorship is probably due to the well-known tendency of Jewish tradition to connect everything with names celebrated in Israel; (4) that the historical notices in the Hebrew Psalter are almost all taken from the books of Samuel (I, II Kings), so that their origin needs not, or even cannot, be traced back to the authors of the Psalms;[2] (5) chiefly, that "many of the titles can be conclusively shown to be erroneous, by the contents and

[1] Karl F. KEIL, Historico-Critical Introduction, vol. i, p. 457 sq. (Engl. Transl., Edinburgh, 1884).

[2] Cf. DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 370; Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii, p. 250 sq. (London, 1862).

Digitized by Google

language of the Psalms to which they are prefixed. Many Psalms ascribed to David assume situations and circumstances wholly unlike any in which he can be supposed to have been placed: some (for instance, Pss. lxviii, cii) refer to the destruction of Jerusalem; the language of others (for instance, Ps. cxxxviii) is unquestionably late; some (for instance, Ps. lxxxv) are mere compilations."[1]

In view of these and other such arguments against the genuineness of many titles, it is easy to understand the significance of the following remarks of one of the latest Catholic commentators on the book of Psalms:[2] "There is really no use in regarding as an integral part of Holy Writ the Hebrew titles and the additional notices found in the Septuagint. It is enough to treat them as traditional documents which go back to a remote antiquity, and which need not be taken into account when there are serious reasons for rejecting them. The Fathers of the Church acted in this wise despite the subtle explanations which they set forth to make something out of the Greek titles."

§ 4. *Gradual Formation of the Psalter.*

1. Principal Difficulties concerning the Question. Several things concur in rendering it difficult to describe the various stages through which the book of Psalms passed before reaching its present form. There is, first of all, the absence of positive data concerning it in the historical portions of the Bible.[3] Next comes the uncertainty which surrounds many of the titles prefixed to the individual Psalms,

[1] A. F. KIRKPATRICK, the Book of Psalms, Introd., p. xxviii. See also DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of Old Test., p. 374 sqq.; J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, the Book of Psalms, vol. i, pp. 96, 97 (7th edit.); W. R. SMITH, Lectures on the Old Test. in the Jewish Church, p. 216 sq. (2d edit.).

[2] H. LESÊTRE, le Livre des Psaumes (in LETHIELLEUX' Bible). pp. l, li.

[3] Such references to the Psalter as are found in II Machabees ii, 13; Luke xx, 42; xxiv, 44; Acts i, 20; Hebr. iv, 7, are too general in their tenor to be of any use in examining the origin and growth of that sacred book.

Digitized by Google

and which naturally prevents one from utilizing freely their references to authorship or to other historical circumstances. The same thing must be said in regard to the diverging accounts respecting authorship which are met with in the later Jewish traditions embodied in the Talmud or referred to by such Christian writers as Origen and St. Jerome. Thus, "according to the Talmudic view, Adam is the author of Ps. xcii (Vulg. Ps. xci), Melchisedech of Ps. cx (Vulg. cix), while Abraham is identified with Ethan the Ezrahite (Ps. lxxxix–Vulg. lxxxviii). But, according to older Jewish tradition attested by Origen, Ps. xcii is by Moses, to whom are assigned Pss. xc–c (Vulg. Pss. lxxxix–xcix) inclusive, according to a general rule that all anonymous pieces are by the same hand with the nearest preceding Psalm whose author is named; and Ps. cx, which by its title is Davidic, seems to have been given to Melchisedech to avoid the dilemma of Matt. xxii, 41 sq. Origen's rule accounts for all the Psalms except i and ii, which were sometimes reckoned as one poem, and appear to have been ascribed to David (Acts iv, 25)."[1] As regards the opinion of St. Jerome[2] and other Christian writers that the collector of the book of Psalms was Esdras, it rests most likely on the apocryphal account of Esdras' work concerning the Sacred Scriptures which is given in the last chapter of the fourth book of Esdras, and which represents him as rewriting the whole Jewish Bible under divine dictation.[3]

But the intricacy of the question arises chiefly from the fact that our present Psalter undoubtedly contains hymns belonging to the period of the Exile and the Restoration,[4] and possibly Psalms written in the time of the Machabees, while it is generally held to comprise Psalms of the period

[1] W. R. SMITH, art. Psalms in Encyclop. Britannica, 9th edit.
[2] Præf. in Psal. ex Hebræo, in MIGNE, Patr. Lat., vol. xxviii, col. 1123.
[3] IV Esdras xiv, 22–50.
[4] Pss. cxxv, cxxxvi, for instance.

Digitized by Google

of David. It thus embraces within its compass poems which extend over a range of several centuries—some five hundred years even if we reject the existence of Machabean Psalms —so that the attempt to describe the origin and gradual growth of a collection formed so slowly is naturally fraught with many difficulties.

2. Leading Facts regarding the Growth of the Psalter Stated and Examined. While it must be granted that the contents of the Psalter will always present the greatest obstacle to a precise knowledge of its origin and growth, it remains true that they also supply important facts by means of which an approximate solution of the question may be reached. The first of these facts consists in the ancient division of the Hebrew Psalter into five books, which has been already described, and which is most naturally accounted for by supposing that the book of Psalms in its present state was formed out of pre-existing smaller collections of sacred hymns. The second fact is connected with the doxologies which now mark the end of the first four books and which, when closely examined, prove that it is not the collector of the whole Psalter who disposed his work in five sections and added a doxology to four of them. For the first three doxologies[1] plainly form no part of the Psalm to which they are appended, but mark the end of the first three books after the pious fashion, common enough in Eastern literature, to close the composition or transcription of a volume with a brief prayer or words of praise (cfr. II Esdras xiii, 31; Micheas vii, 20; Daniel xiv, 42). As regards the close of the fourth book,[2] the

[1] Ps. xl, 14; Ps. lxxi, 18, 19; Ps. lxxxviii, 53.

[2] The last verse of Ps. cv reads as follows:

Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Israel,
From everlasting to everlasting!
And let all the people say:
Amen! Alleluia!

Digitized by Google

rubric "And let all the people say: Amen! Alleluia!" which follows the doxology, implies that this doxology was actually sung at the end of the Psalm, and so is it taken in I Paralip. xvi, where the Psalm cv is quoted, and where the imperatives are changed to perfects: "And all the people *said* Amen, and *gave praise* to God."[1] This shows that, differently from the preceding doxologies, the one at the end of the fourth book of Psalms does not really mark the close of a collection once separate, and in point of fact Books IV and V have so many characteristic features in common[2] that there is every reason to regard them as a single great group. It is not probable, therefore, that the four doxologies are the work of one and the same collector of the Psalms.

A third and most important fact to bear in mind concerning the growth of the book of Psalms is that Psalms occur in our Psalter in a *double* recension, the two forms exhibiting such slight differences in the Original Text that they are not likely to have been incorporated by a single hand: thus Ps. liii (Vulg. lii) is the same as Ps. xiv (Vulg. xiii); Ps. lxx (Vulg. lxix) is identical with Ps. xl, 14 sqq. (Vulg. xxxix, 13 sqq.); Ps. cviii (Vulg. cvii) = Ps. lvii, 7–11 + Ps. lx, 5–12 (Vulg. Ps. lvi, 8–12 + Ps. lix, 6c–14); Ps. cxv, 4–11 (Vulg. cxiii, second part, 1–11) = Ps. cxxxv, 15–20 (Vulg. cxxxiv, 15–20).

Another fact pointing in the same direction consists in the manner in which the Psalms ascribed to the same author are often distributed, viz., in independent groups. This distribution is particularly significant in connection with

[1] I Paralip. xvi, 36. The expression "gave praise to God" corresponds to *Alleluia*, "Praise ye Yahweh."

[2] These common characteristics are: (1) the use of the divine name Yahweh in both books; (2) the absence of titles to many Psalms; (3) the scarcity of musical and liturgical additions; (4) obscure titles like those often found in the preceding books are entirely absent.

Digitized by Google

the first three books, as may be easily seen by means of the following scheme:

PRESENT ORDER OF CONTENTS IN BOOKS I–III. IN RESPECT OF ASCRIBED AUTHORSHIP.

Book I.	David	Pss. i–xl.
	(Doxology : Ps. xl, 14.)	
Book II.	The Sons of Core	Pss. xli–xlviii.
	Asaph	Ps. xlix.
	David	Pss. l–lxxi.
	(Doxology : Ps. lxxi, 18, 19; followed by the subscription: "The prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended.")	
Book III.	Asaph	Pss. lxxii–lxxxii.
	Miscellaneous	Pss. lxxxiii–lxxxviii.
	(Doxology : Ps. lxxxviii, 53.)[1]	

The present division of the Davidic Psalms of Books I and II into two independent groups is clearly the work of more than one collector; for if the final collector had gathered these poems together for the first time, he would naturally have made one group, not two, of canticles ascribed to the Royal Prophet. And this view is powerfully confirmed by the remark that a collector, knowing that there were still eighteen Davidic Psalms to be embodied in the following books, would scarcely have closed Book II (Ps. lxxi, 20) with the words: "The prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended." Again, the separation of the Asaphic Psalm xlix in Book II from the great group of Asaphic Psalms (Pss. lxxii–lxxxii) in Book III leads to the same conclusion, viz., that not one, but several collectors worked

[1] The principal groups of Psalms in Books IV and V are:

Book IV.	Moses	Ps. lxxxix.
	Anonymous	Pss. xc–cv.
Book V.	David	Pss. cvii–cix; cxxxvii–cxliv.
	Gradual Psalms	Pss. cxix–cxxxiii.
	Alleluia Psalms	Pss. cx–cxvii; cxlv–cl.

Digitized by Google

at bringing the contents of the Psalter into their present order.

This general conclusion is borne out by a fifth and important fact, to wit, the remarkable manner in which the use of the divine names *Yahweh* and *Elohim* varies in the different parts of the Psalter :

Book.		Yahweh.	Elohim.
I.	. . . . .	272 times.	15 times.
II.	. . . . .	30 times.	164 times.
III.	Pss. lxxii–lxxxii . .	13 times.	36 times.
	Pss. lxxxiii–lxxxviii .	31 times.	7 times.
IV.	. . . . .	103 times.	0
V.	. . . . .	236 times.	7 times.[1]

A careful examination of this use shows that the preponderance of *Elohim* over *Yahweh* in Book II and in Pss. lxxii–lxxxii of Book III is not due to the preference of the divine name *Elohim* by the authors of the individual Psalms. Such a preference is improbable in itself, since Yahweh is the proper name of the God of Israel ; and further, it is in opposition to two fully-ascertained facts : (1) the one and the same Psalm which occurs in the double recension spoken of above has *Yahweh* in its first form (Ps. xiii) and *Elohim* in its second (Ps. lii) ; (2) Ps. lxix, which repeats part of Ps. xxxix, reads *Elohim* no less than six times where *Yahweh* is found in the earlier form (Ps. xxxix). Whence it is only natural to infer that in their primitive form Book II and Pss. lii–lxxii of Book III had *Yahweh* like the rest of the Psalter, but that they passed through the hands of a compiler who *changed* that sacred name into *Elohim*.

A sixth fact, also to be taken into account, is supplied by a closer examination of the *Elohistic* collection (Book ii +

[1] As well stated by VIGOUROUX (Manuel Biblique, vol. ii. n. 651). "Yahweh is exclusively used in Book IV ; and the same thing may be said of Book V. for *Elohim* is found only in two of its passages which are borrowed from Psalms in the preceding Book."

Digitized by Google

Pss. lii–lxxii of Book III). Though characterized throughout by the compiler's use of *Elohim*, this collection contains two distinct elements, which may be easily grouped as follows:

1. Psalms ascribed to David (Pss. l–lxxi.)
2. Psalms ascribed to Levitical Choirs: { to the Sons of Core (Pss. xli–xlviii); to Asaph (Pss. xlix, lxxii–lxxxii).

But in the present arrangement of Psalms in the Elohistic collection,[1] the group of Davidic hymns (marked off as a distinct section by the subscription at the end of Ps. lxxi) is placed *between* two groups of Levitical Psalms, and even separates the Asaphic Ps. xlix from the body of the Asaphic collection (Pss. lxxii–lxxxii). Now this order is not natural, and probably is not the original one.

The Asaphic Ps. xlix goes naturally with the main body of the Asaphic hymns (Pss. lxxii–lxxxii). In like manner Pss. xli–xlviii, a *Levitical* group, goes with Pss. xlix, lxxii–lxxxii, also a *Levitical* group; while Pss. l–lxxi, a Davidic collection, would naturally precede both Levitical groups as a sequel to the great Davidic collection of Book I. In this way an arrangement at once simple and complete is obtained: (1) a Davidic collection with the subscription: "The prayers of David are ended"; (2) two collections of Levitical Psalms (the first ascribed to the Sons of Core, the second to Asaph). This is most likely the older arrangement which was altered by the final collector into the present order, because he wished to show by a distinct mark that the two Davidic collections (Pss. i–xl; Pss. l–lxxi)

[1] Here is the present arrangement of the contents in the Elohistic collection:

Pss. xli–xlviii	ascribed to the Sons of Core.
Pss. xlix	ascribed to Asaph (leader of David's choir: I Paralip. vi, 39).
Pss. l–lxxi	ascribed to David (Subscription in Ps. lxxi, 20).
Pss. lxxii–lxxxii	ascribed to Asaph.

Digitized by Google

were originally separate, and also utilize the subscription to Ps. lxxi to indicate the end of a book.

If we now take up Books IV and V, we easily notice the fact that "they are really one book, for the doxology of Ps. cv belongs to the Psalm, and there is no clear mark of difference in subject, character, or editorial treatment in the Psalms which precede and which follow it."[1] If this primitive larger book appears now divided into two smaller ones, it is because, as critics generally suppose, the final collector wished to reproduce in connection with the first section of the Third Canon in the Hebrew Text the fivefold division of the Torah, or First Canon. That it should be broken into two at the end of Ps. cv was naturally suggested by verse 48, which reads very much like a doxology, though it is really a part of the Psalm.

Another fact, most important to bear in mind, is that Ps. cvii, belonging to the last large collection (Books IV and V), is made up of two Elohim Psalms in the *Elohistic* form. Now since, as we saw above, the Elohim Psalms got their characteristic use of *Elohim* from their common editor, it follows that the last large collection of Psalms (Books IV and V) was made after the Elohistic collection (Book II + Pss. lxxii–lxxxii of Book III) had received the editorial treatment already described. It follows also that the final editor of Books IV and V left all the Psalms therein contained with the names of God just as they came into his hands. Clearly, then, he is in every way distinct from the Elohistic editor of Book II + Ps. lxxii–lxxxii of Book III.

Lastly, an examination of Books IV and V in our present Psalter leads us to admit that the great collection which they go to make up "is in several parts based upon shorter, independent collections: thus Pss. xci–xcix form a group

[1] W. R. SMITH, Lectures on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church p 200 (2d edit.) The characteristics common to both Books IV and V have been already pointed out.

Digitized by Google

the Psalms in which, though assigned to no particular author, show much similarity in both subject-matter and expression; Pss. cx–cxvii form the series of the *Hallel*-Psalms; Pss. cxix–cxxxiii are the fifteen Gradual Psalms or "Songs of Ascents"; Pss. cvii–cix, cxxxvii–cxliv are two groups of hymns ascribed to David."[1]

All the facts thus far stated and examined suggest the following steps in the formation of the book of Psalms:

(1) Formation of First Davidic Collection with closing Doxology, Pss. i–xl.[2]

(2) Formation of Second Davidic Collection with Doxology and Subscription, Pss. l–lxxi.

(3) Formation of a Twofold Levitical Collection, . . . Pss. xli–xlviii, Pss. xlix + lxxii–lxxxii.

(4) An Elohistic Redaction and Combination of the two preceding Collections (2, 3).

(5) The Addition to this Elohistic Compilation (4) of a non-Elohistic Appendix and Doxology (lxxxiii–lxxxviii).

(6) The Yahwistic compilation of several groups of Psalms, Pss. lxxxix–cl.

(7) The Division of this Yahwistic compilation into two books: Book iv. Pss. lxxxix–cv.; Book v: Pss. cvi–cl.[3]

3. Authorship and Date of the Davidic Collections and of the Completion of the Psalter. It would be a long and indeed, because of the scarcity of data, an almost useless task to treat of the authors and dates that may be assigned to the various stages which have just been indicated in the growth of the book of Psalms. We shall therefore simply examine the authorship and date (1) of the Davidic collections (Book I and

[1] DRIVER, Introd to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 373.

[2] The anonymous Pss. i and ii seem, however, to have been added to the general collection after it had been practically completed.

[3] Cfr. W. R. SMITH, art. Psalms. in Encyclop. Britannica (9th edit.).

Digitized by Google

Pss. l–lxxi of Book II),[1] and (2) of the completion of the whole Psalter.

It is generally granted that if the titles of the individual Psalms in the Davidic collections could be relied on implicitly, not only the authorship of those Psalms, but also the pre-exilic antiquity of the collections themselves, would be at once established. But strong reasons have led many contemporary scholars to reject the value of those titles.[2] They think that in both collections many Psalms, when carefully studied in the light of their contents, cannot possibly be the work of David. For example, Pss. xix, xx contain good wishes for a king, who is either addressed in the second person or spoken of in the third; both evidently spring out of the regard which was entertained towards him by his subjects, and consequently "are not spoken by a king, but addressed to him by his devoted people; Pss. v, xxvi allude to the Temple[3] (which did not exist in David's time), and the author of the latter hymn desires "that he may dwell in the House of the Lord all the days of his life."[4] Even in the older Davidic Psalm-book there is a whole series of Psalms in which the writer identifies himself with the poor and needy, the righteous people of God suffering in silence at the hands of the wicked, without other hope than patiently to wait for the interposition of Yahweh (Pss. xi, xxiv, xxxvi, xxxvii). Nothing can be farther removed than this from any possible situation in the life of the David of the books of Samuel. Most of these

[1] It is true that St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, Cassiodorus, St. Thomas, etc., have ascribed the authorship of all the Psalms to David; but as at the present day no scholar is tempted to do so, it is useless to show that David did not compose all the Psalms. It is only in reference to Psalms of Book I and Pss. l–lxxi of Book II, which are ascribed to David and have apparently the best right to be considered as going back to David's time, that nowadays the question of David's authorship is discussed.

[2] These reasons are well set forth by DRIVER, Introduction to the Literat. of the Old Test., pp 374–377.

[3] Ps. v. 8; Ps. xxvi, 4.

[4] Ps xxvi, 4.

Digitized by Google

Psalms are referred by the defenders of the titles to the time when David was pursued by Saul. But it is quite unhistorical to represent Saul as a man who persecuted and spoiled all the quiet and godly souls in Israel; and David and his friends were never helpless sufferers—the quiet or timid in the land (xxxiv, 20), dumb amidst all oppression (xxxvii, 13, 14). And such a Psalm as xxxvi, where the Psalmist calls himself an old man (verse 25), must, on the traditional view, be spoken by David late in his prosperous reign; yet we have the same situation—the wicked rampant, the righteous suffering in silence, as if David were not a king who sat on his throne meting out justice and judgment to all his people (II Sam. viii, 15).[1] If Psalms ix, xxxvi represent the state of things in the time of David, the books of Samuel are the most partial of histories, and the reign of the son of Jesse was not the golden age which it appeared to all subsequent generations."[2]

Similar difficulties, we are told, stand in the way of ascribing to David Pss. l–lxxi of Book II. For example, Ps. lvii is a denunciation of *unjust* judges, not indeed after the manner of a monarch on whose will it depends to remove them, but after that of one who is powerless to take action himself; "Ps. lviii is stated in the title to have been composed by David when his house was watched by Saul's messengers (I Sam. xix, 11), but the Psalm shows plainly that the poet who wrote it is resident in a city attacked by heathen or ungodly foes, whom he prays God to cast down, that His power may be manifest *to the ends of the earth* (verses 6–9, 12–14; notice especially the 'nations')—both inconsistent with the feelings which David entertained tow-

[1] See also Pss. v, 8–10; vi, 7 sqq.; xvi, 9–14; xxi, 11 sqq.; xxv, 9 sqq; xxvi, 10 ("For my father and my mother have forsaken me")–12; xxvii, 3–5; xxxiv, 11 sqq.; etc., a careful reading of which proves that the Psalmist's words do not correspond really to David's situation but are those of a man in entirely different circumstances.

[2] W. R. Smith, the Old Test. in the Jewish Church, p. 2.6 sq. (2d edit.).

Digitized by Google

ards Saul (I Sam. xxiv, 6, etc.), and implying relations with the 'nations,' which did not then exist. The titles in these and similar cases are palpably incongruous, and appear sometimes to have been merely suggested to the compiler by a superficial view of particular expressions (for instance, Ps. li, 4, supposed to point to Doeg; liii, 5, to the men of Ziph; lv, 3, to the Philistines; lvi, 4, to Saul; lviii, 4, to Saul's messengers; and lxii, 2[b], to the wilderness of Juda). But the situation and the circumstances implied by the Psalm, *as a whole*, are in each instance different from those of David."[1]

Having thus made sufficiently plain the unreliable character of so many titles in the Davidic collections, critics felt more free to ascribe many Psalms therein contained to a date later than David's time, and the collections themselves to a still later date. Some of them doubt that any Psalm of the Davidic collections was really composed by David, and they hold the collections to be post-exilic. Most recent scholars, however, refrain from the assumption that David did not write any of the Psalms now found in the Davidic collections. According to them, "David's skill as poet and musician, and his interest in the development of religious music, are attested by the earliest records.[2] Later times pointed to him as the founder of the services of the sanctuary.[3] The leaders of the return from the Exile believed themselves to be restoring his institutions.[4] But, in particular, the incorporation of Ps. xvii in the book of Samuel[5] as a specimen of David's poetry illustrating his character and genius is the strongest evidence in favor of

[1] DRIVER, Introduction, p. 376 sq.

[2] See I Samuel xvi, 17 sqq.; xviii, 10; II Sam. i, 17 sqq.; iii, 33 sqq; vi, 5, 15; xxii, 1; xxiii, 1 sqq.; Amos vi, 5.

[3] II Paralip. xxix, 30.

[4] Esdras iii, 10; Nehem. xii, 24, 35, 45.

[5] II Samuel xxii.

Digitized by Google

regarding David as the founder of the Psalter. . . . This Psalm has all the freshness of creative genius. It can hardly have been the solitary production of its author. If such a Psalm could have been written by David, so might many others."[1] Moreover, the fact that the Royal Prophet composed sacred hymns which were treasured up was clearly the reason which induced rabbis, at a later date, to ascribe to him many others, though opposed to the historical circumstances of David's time, and finally the entire book of Psalms.

According to the same scholars, the reigns of Josaphat and Ezechias were marked by fresh outbursts of Psalm poetry. Under Ezechias a collection of Proverbs is known to have been made. So that it is only natural to think of the Davidic collections of Psalms as having probably originated at this time, if not earlier.

To all this, however, it is replied: (1) that as regards the Davidic authorship of certain Psalms, early tradition is really silent, since it connects David's, name not with Psalm-writing, but with musical skill, and even the invention of musical instruments;[2] (2) that as regards the collections themselves, they were most likely made at a comparatively late date—apparently after the Exile—else Psalms whose contents are so utterly at variance with the historical circumstances of David's reign would not have been ascribed to him by the collectors.[3]

A brief reference remains to be made to the question concerning the authorship and date of the completion of

[1] A. F. KIRKPATRICK, the Book of Psalms, Introd., p xxxii sq. "The evidence for Davidic authorship is strongest for Ps xvii. a thanksgiving for success in war . . . Other Psalms often ascribed to David by modern critics are iii; iv; vi–xii; xiv; xv ii. 1-6; xxiii, 7-10; xxviii; xxxi" (W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction p. 144 and footn. 2).

[2] Amos vi, 5; Nehemias, xii, 36; II Sam xxiii. 1 Cfr. W. R. SMITH. Old Test. In the Jewish Church, p. 220 sqq.; DRIVER, Introduction p. 378 sq.

[3] W. R. SMITH. loc. cit., p. 216; DRIVER, loc. cit. p. 377.

Digitized by Google

the whole Psalter. According to most Catholic scholars, more or less directly influenced by the view of such conservative Protestant writers as Keil and Delitzsch, the important duty of bringing the Psalter to its completion was discharged by Esdras. Apparently the chief ground for this opinion consists in the fact that no title ascribes any Psalm to a later period. Several Catholic writers,[1] however, more accustomed to judge of the authorship and date of the Psalms from their contents than from their titles, agree with a large number of independent Protestant critics in admitting Psalms composed during the Machabean period (about 160–70 B.C.), and in regarding the Psalter as probably closed only a comparatively short time before the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (about 130 B. C.). Of course the question whether such poems as Pss. xliii, lxxiii, lxxviii, lix, lxxix, lxxxii, etc., which are more commonly styled "Machabean," belong really to the Machabean age is a question of exegesis. Consequently it had better be left to be solved by a detailed study of their contents. It seems, however, that some of the Psalms just enumerated present such features as to make it very probable that they belong to the Machabean age, and to no other.[2]

In regard to the opinion that in many Psalms the speaker, though using the first person singular, is not really an individual, but the *community*, see DRIVER, Introduction, p. 389 sqq, and the works referred to there.

[1] Among them may be mentioned the Jesuits PATRIZI, PALMIERI, CUECI, Fathers SCHEGG VAN STEENKISTE, etc. In the current editions of the Douay Version Ps. lxxviii is said to "appear to belong to the time of the Machabees."

[2] For general arguments *for* and *against* the Machabean Psalms, see H. LESÊTRE, le Livre des Psaumes, p. xliv sqq; CORNELY, Specialis Introductio in Didacticos et Propheticos Veteris Test. Libros, p. 108 sqq.; A. F. KIRKPATRICK, the Book of Psalms Introd., p xxxv sqq.; W. R. SMITH, Old Test. in Jewish Church, p. 210 sqq. (2d edit); T. K. CHEYNE, the Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter; etc.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER IV.

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

I. NAMES AND GENERAL OBJECT:

1. Principal Names (Mishle Sh'lomo ; Wisdom).
2. General Object (a Manual of Hebrew Wisdom).

II. ORIGINAL TEXT AND PRINCIPAL VERSIONS:

1. The Hebrew Text (Causes of its Defective Condition).
2. Principal Versions:
   - The Septuagint (Points to a Text different from the Massoretic).
   - The Peshitto (its Mixture of Readings).
   - The Vulgate (Relation to the Hebrew and the Septuagint).

III. GRADUAL FORMATION OF THE BOOK OF PROVERBS:

1. The Various Collections pointed out and described:
   - The Title: Aim and Importance of the Work (i, 1–6).
   - Part I (i, 7–ix). Introductory to the Collection which follows.
   - Part II (x–xxii, 16). Collection ascribed to Solomon.
     Two Minor Collections: The Words of the Wise (xxii, 16–xxiv, 22 ; xxiv, 23–34).
   - Part III (xxv–xxix). "Proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Ezechias copied out."
     Two Minor Collections:
     - the Words of Agur (xxx).
     - the Words of Lamuel (xxxi, 1–9).
   - In Conclusion: Alphabetical Description of a Virtuous Woman (xxxi, 10–31).
2. Probable Authorship and Date
   - of the Minor Collections (the Words of the Wise ; the Words of Agur and Lamuel ; the Description of the Virtuous Woman).
   - of the Solomonic Collections.
   - of the Whole Book.
3. Literary Analogy between the Book of Proverbs and the Psalter.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

§ 1. *Names and General Object.*

1. Principal Names. In the Hebrew Bible, the book of Proverbs bears the name of *Mishle Sh'lomo* (or simply *Mishle*) from its opening words. This is a very old name, as shown by the fact that it is the one commonly used in the Talmud, and that its Greek literal rendering, *Παροιμίαι Σολομῶντος* (or simply *Παροιμίαι*), appears in the Septuagint Version. In the early Christian Church, the Greek title was simply adopted at first from the Septuagint, and next rendered by *Proverbia Salomonis* in the Old Latin translation. Under this form, it was naturally embodied by St. Jerome in the Vulgate,[1] whence comes directly the usual English title of *Proverbs.*

It is true that the book of Proverbs is also quoted by early Church Fathers as *Σοφία*, "wisdom," or *Ἡ πανάρετος σοφία*, "all-virtuous wisdom," and that the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are said, in the Talmud, to be both "books of wisdom," but these designations refer rather to the contents than to the titles by which either Proverbs or Ecclesiastes was known.[2]

[1] In the official edition of the Vulgate, the title is: *Liber Proverbiorum, quem Hebræi Misle appellant.*

[2] Cfr., in this connection, W. A. Wright, art. Proverbs (book of). in Smith. Bible Dict.; Prof. C. H. Toy, the Book of Proverbs (in the International Critical Commentary), p. v sq.; H. Lesêtre, le Livre des Proverbes, p. 1; etc.

Digitized by Google

2. General Object. The more closely one inquires into the contents of the book of Proverbs, the more fully he will realize that the name of *Wisdom* truly sets forth the general object of that inspired writing. From beginning to end, the collections of pithy sayings or descriptions which go to make up the book of Proverbs aim at inculcating wisdom as understood by the Hebrews of old, that is, "perfection of knowledge showing itself in action, whether in the case of king or peasant, statesman or artisan, philosopher or unlearned."[1] As well pointed out by Bp. Hanneberg,[2] "the poet is a close observer of human life, and his own daily experience he turns into profit to impart practical lessons and give valuable counsels. It is true that he displays sagacity rather than wisdom, and is caustic far more than kindly. Yet he never loses sight of his moral aim, which is to strengthen man against the ills and dangers of his mortal condition. . . . Thus, then, those sentences which stand apparently isolated, those Proverbs which seem at first sight to be altogether disconnected, are really pervaded by one spirit, and made subservient to the one and the same purpose, viz., that of fitting man's mind for the battle of life. Yea, more: they tend to impart to him something of the strength he needs to overcome all difficulties, because they are rays sent forth from that Wisdom which resides with God, and are intended to illumine and strengthen all men."

To inculcate that wisdom of Israel which differed chiefly from that of the neighboring nations by the way in which it ran up into morality and religion, the "wise men"[3] whose sayings are gathered together in the book of Proverbs used that kind of literary composition which is des-

[1] W. J. Deane, the Book of Wisdom, p. 25.

[2] Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 410 sq. (French Transl.). See also W. Sanday, Inspiration, p. 201 sqq.

[3] Cfr. Proverbs xxii, 16; xxiv, 23.

Digitized by Google

ignated by the Hebrew word *Mashal* (hence the title of *Mishle* given to the whole book) and the precise nature of which can hardly be described, because of the want of a corresponding kind of composition in our Western literatures. According to Prof. Driver,[1] "the Hebrew term *mashal* denotes properly a *representation*, i.e. a statement not relating solely to a single fact, but *standing for* or *representing* other similar facts. The statement constituting the *mashal* may be one deduced from a particular instance, but capable of application to other instances of a similar kind, or it may be a generalization from experience, such as in the nature of the case admits of constantly fresh application. The *mashal* is by usage limited almost entirely to observations relative to human life and character, and is expressed commonly in a short, pointed form. Sometimes the *mashal* includes a comparison, or is expressed in figurative or enigmatic language (cfr. Prov. i, 6)."

This general description of the *mashal* is in thorough harmony with the practical aim which the Hebrew "wise men" had always in view.[2] Taking for granted the religious truths believed in Israel, they wished to inculcate in a concrete and striking way the manner of conduct which a faithful worshipper of Yahweh should follow. But nothing was better fitted for this purpose than the *mashal* or maxim whose truth was clearly based on a close observation of human life, and whose poetical form appealed powerfully to the imagination of those for whom it was originally intended.

[1] Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 394. See also Tov, Lesêtre, W. A. Wright, loc. cit.

[2] This view of the *mashal* corresponds only to *most* of the maxims and reflections contained in the book of Proverbs. It does not apply to the magnificent description of wisdom in Prov. viii, for example. The Revised Version has rendered the word *mᶜshalim* by "sayings" (in Prov. xxiv, 23), which is certainly a better rendering than "proverbs," or "words." or "parables." Perhaps the nearest Western equivalent to the Hebrew term is the French word *pensées*, as applied to the celebrated prose work of Blaise Pascal.

Digitized by Google

§ 2. *Original Text and Principal Ancient Versions.*

1. The Hebrew Text of the Book of Proverbs.

As might naturally be expected in connection with a book chiefly made up of pithy sayings, and apparently intended to serve as a manual of conduct for the children of Israel in the various walks of life, the original text of the book of Proverbs experienced numerous alterations in the course of its transmission. It is true that many of the textual imperfections disclosed by the study of the original Hebrew may, with some probability, be traced back to the period during which the maxims of the Hebrew "wise men" were preserved orally.[1] But all the errors of the Massoretic Text which critics have pointed out, chiefly in reference to chap. x sqq., are not adequately explained in this manner.[2] After they had been written down those sententious or enigmatic sayings were not more accurately transcribed than the other parts of the Hebrew Text, so that the usual misunderstandings and misrepresentations of copyists must needs be admitted here. "It does not appear," however, "that changes were made in *Proverbs* in the interests of theological opinion, or from a sense of propriety or decency (*causa honoris, causa reverentiæ*, etc.); . . . the immunity of *Proverbs* is due in part to its untheological character" (that is, to its pre-eminently moral or practical character), "in part to the fact that it was looked on as less sacred and authoritative than the Pentateuch and the Prophetic writings."[3]

[1] Cfr. Rabbi L. Wogue, Histoire de la Bible et de la Révélation Biblique, p. 45 sq.

[2] For the various readings connected with the text of the book of Proverbs, cfr., beside the commentators on that book, Samuel Davidson, the Hebrew Text of the Old Test., revised from critical sources, pp. 167-175.

[3] C. H. Toy, the Book of Proverbs, pp xxxi, xxxii. Such changes were made in other books of the Old Testament before the beginning of the Christian era. Cfr. T. K. Abbott, Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Test.; and the article in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* for February, 1896, by the present writer.

Digitized by Google

Perhaps the most influential cause of the textual imperfections of the book of Proverbs is to be found in the fact that the copyists of the pithy sayings it contains knew, or at least imagined they knew, by memory the exact words they had to write out. For the more they would be tempted to trust their memory, the more also they would be liable to make involuntary changes which, once introduced, were preserved or even added to by subsequent transcribers.

2. Principal Ancient Versions. The defective condition of our present Hebrew Text of the book of Proverbs is brought home to us not only by a close study of its contents, but also by a comparison of its readings with those of the principal ancient Versions. Prominent among these stands the Septuagint translation, for it represents in general an older text which exhibited most important differences from the Massoretic, in point of omissions, transpositions, and additions. The principal differences in chaps. i–ix consist in the addition of two verses at the end of chap. iv; of the commendation of the bee as an example, after a similar commendation of the ant in chap. vi, 6–8; of several traits in the description of the wise and foolish women in chap. ix. In the rest of the book the textual differences are more numerous and important. They consist in (1) *omissions:* xi, 4; xiii, 6; xvi, 1–4; xviii, 23–24; xix, 1–2; xx, 14–19; etc.; (2) *transpositions:* the third verse of chap. xix in the Hebrew is the last verse of chap. xviii in the Septuagint; in chap. xx of the same Version verses 20–22 are placed between verses 9 and 10; after verse 22 of chap. xxiv in the Septuagint we read xxix, 27, followed by four distichs nowhere found in the Hebrew; etc.; (3) *additions:* proverbs are inserted between x, 4 and x, 5; xi, 16 and xi, 17; xii, 11 and xii, 12; in chap. xvi no less

Digitized by Google

than five proverbs not found in the Hebrew Text are also added; etc.

When these and other such differences are sifted out, and full allowance is made for the amount of liberty which the translator has sometimes taken either to give his renderings a smoother and more idiomatic Greek form or to obtain a better antithesis between two lines, etc., it remains clear that the Greek book of Proverbs is not a mere translation, more or less faithful, of the Hebrew Text in the form in which it has come down to us. While its "omissions usually indicate a Hebrew scribal *plus*,"[1] its additions contain much new matter probably based on a Hebrew original, and its transpositions are not due to the caprice of a Greek translator, but rather to his faithfulness in following the arrangement of the Text which lay before him. Whence it has been inferred by Vigouroux that "most of the variations of the Septuagint are derived from a different Hebrew original."[2]

Intimately connected with the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint translation is the Peshitto or Syriac Version in its present condition. It agrees sometimes with the original Hebrew against the Septuagint; sometimes, on the contrary, with the Septuagint against the Hebrew Text, so that it is difficult to define the precise relation in which it stands to either. The fact that it presents the same general material and arrangement as the Hebrew makes it probable that it is based on it; while the nature of its points of agreement with the Septuagint shows that in certain passages it has been influenced by the latter. Perhaps the best explanation of these mixed features of the Syriac Version is to be found in the supposition that it was made substantially and

[1] C. H. Toy, loc. cit., p xxxii.

[2] Vigouroux, Manuel Biblique. vol. ii, no 822, § 2. The peculiar nature of this different Hebrew original will be determined in the sequel.

Digitized by Google

directly from the Hebrew with respect to the Septuagint, whose peculiar readings were at times adopted by the Syriac translator.[1] As the Peshitto is often free in its renderings, and its primitive text may have been subjected to revision, it must be used with caution in the criticism of both the Hebrew and the Septuagint.

The general relation which exists between the Latin Vulgate and either the original Hebrew or the Septuagint Version is more definitely known. St. Jerome, whose translation of the book of Proverbs is embodied in the Vulgate, took for the basis of his work the *Hebraica Veritas*, and for the most part followed closely its readings, which are practically the same as those of our present Hebrew Text. His deviations from it are traceable to the Septuagint through the Old Latin Version, which had been made closely from the Greek, and from which he did not always feel free to depart. His renderings directly from the Hebrew represent the Jewish exegesis of his time, and are seldom of much help in those passages of the original text which are peculiarly difficult.

§ 3. *Gradual Formation of the Book of Proverbs.*

1. The Various Collections Pointed out and Described. The contents of the book of Proverbs, like those of the Psalter, bear distinct witness to its compilatory character. The work begins with the general title: "Mishle Sh^{e}lomo, the son of David, King of Israel," which is immediately followed by a Prologue (i, 2–6) setting forth the aim and importance of the book; the whole collection aims at imparting wisdom and enabling men to understand all kinds of *mashals*.

The first Part of the book (i, 7–ix)—itself an Introduction to the collection of proverbs which follows—is a "com-

[1] Cfr. T. K. Cheyne, Job and Solomon, p. 174.

Digitized by Google

mendation of Wisdom."[1] In it "the writer, speaking like a father (i, 8 and repeatedly, 'my son') to an imagined pupil or disciple, warns him against the dangers and temptations to which he is most likely to be exposed, invites him affectionately to listen to his precepts and commends to him the claims of *Wisdom* to be his guide and friend. No definite arrangement can be traced in the subjects treated;[2] nor is the argument logically articulated: the discourse flows on till the topic on hand is exhausted, and then it recommences with another. . . .

"The form is throughout poetical, and the parallelism of members is, as a rule, carefully observed. The style is flowing, forming in this respect as strong a contrast as possible to that of the 'proverbs' which follow (chap. x sqq.): instead of a series of thoughts, each forcibly expressed, but disconnected with one another, a thought is here developed at length and presented from different points of view."[3]

The second Part of the book extends from chap. x to chap. xxii, 6, and bears the title: "Mishle Sh^e^lomo." It is made up of independent aphorisms in couplet form. and arranged in no particular order. In many cases a proverb, in its entirety or in part, is *repeated*, at times, however, with some slight changes of expression.[4] Most of the sayings included in this large collection are general inferences from facts of secular life, and tend to demonstrate the profit of wisdom and the disadvantage of folly by pointing out their

[1] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 452 (Engl. Transl.). So also EWALD, CHEYNE, DRIVER, etc.

[2] For the principal subdivisions see C. H. TOY, the Book of Proverbs, p. vi. This scholar calls the first part of the book a series of *philosophical discourses* (loc. cit., p. vii). See also VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 829, who admits "a notable difference in composition between the first and second collections."

[3] DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 395. The similarity of tone, warmth of feeling, and even of expression between Proverbs i-ix and Deuteronomy has been rightly remarked by DELITZSCH, das Sal. Spruchbuch.

[4] For numerous instances, see DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 397; VIGOUROUX, loc. cit., vol. ii, no. 824; CHEYNE, Job and Solomon, p. 133; etc.

Digitized by Google

respective consequences on the principle which pervades the entire collection, that men are rewarded in this life according to their works. The characters most frequently delineated, after the wise man and the fool, are the rich and the poor, the diligent and the slothful, the scorner, etc. The king is spoken of in terms of respect and appreciation, and all the associations connected with him are bright and happy. The general condition of society seems one of settled order and moderate prosperity, an injudicious or quarrelsome wife being one of the most serious troubles of life. Many of the religious proverbs are very beautiful, and the great prophetic teaching that righteousness is more acceptable to God than sacrifice is included among them.[1]

Appended to this second part of the book of Proverbs are two minor collections (xxii, 17–xxiv, 22; xxiv, 23–34), chiefly made up of aphoristic quatrains. The first Appendix begins with a few introductory verses (xxii, 17–21) requesting attention to the counsels which follow and which are called the "words of the wise." These counsels themselves are not a mere collection of individual proverbs, like the second part of the book; but a body of maxims worked up usually into a more or less consecutive argument, after the manner of treatment of the "praise of Wisdom" in chaps. i–ix. "The maxims are mostly of a very practical character; for instance, against becoming surety for another (xxii, 26 sq.), against indulging to excess in unwonted dainties (xxiii, 1–3), against the undue pursuit of riches (xxiii, 4 sq.), and especially against gluttony and drunkenness (which, it is rather remarkable, is only commented on twice in the numerous proverbs contained in the second part) (xxiii, 20 sq., 29–35)."[2] The second minor collection (xxiv, 23–24),

[1] For details, see CHEYNE, loc. cit., p. 134 sqq. His valuable remarks are well summed up by DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 398.

[2] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 399.

Digitized by Google

which is regarded by some scholars as an appendix to the preceding small collection (xxii, 17–xxiv, 22), has for its title: "These also are sayings of the wise." The proverbs it contains conclude with a parable or apologue apparently drawn from the writer's experience.[1]

The third Part of the work comprises chaps. xxv–xxix with the title: "These are also *Mishle Sh'lomo*, which the men of Ezechias, king of Juda, copied out." Like the second part (chaps. x–xxii, 6) it is chiefly made up of aphoristic couplets, many of which are likewise antithetic. But while in these and other respects these two parts resemble each other, they exhibit several important differences. Not only are the maxims more frequently grouped by real community of subject in the third than in the second part, but a new type of proverbs,[2] which is almost altogether foreign to this second part, prevails in chaps. xxv–xxvii of the third. Again, the state of society which is reflected in these two parts is widely different. On the whole, the proverbs in chaps. xxv–xxix imply less settled and prosperous times than those in chaps. x–xxii, 6; and the king or ruler is not presented in the same favorable light.[3]

As the second part of the book of Proverbs is followed by two minor collections, so is it also with the third part. The first of these minor collections (chap. xxx) has for its title: "The words of Agur, the son of Yakeh." Among its contents we may more particularly notice "Agur's meditation on the Divine Transcendence"[4] and several groups of *numerical* proverbs, thus called from the use made in them of the number four (cfr. verses 15–16; 18–20; 21–23;

[1] Verses 33, 34 of chap. xxiv seem to have been taken over from vi, 10, 11.

[2] This is the *comparative* type wherein "an object is illustrated by some *figure* derived from nature or human life, the comparison being sometimes expressed distinctly, sometimes left to the reader to be inferred from the mere juxtaposition of two ideas" (DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 400). Cfr. Prov. xxvi, 2; xxv, 25; etc.

[3] Cfr. xxv, 3-5; xxviii, 2, 15 sq., 28; xxix, 2, 4, 16.

[4] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 155.

Digitized by Google

etc.). The second minor collection (xxxi, 1–9) is inscribed: "The words of Lamuel, a king: the oracle which his mother taught him." In it the queen-mother warns her son against sensuality and immoderate use of wine, and exhorts him to relieve the necessities and vindicate the rights of the poor. The language of xxxi, 1–9 in the original contains strong Aramaisms.

The book concludes with the description of a virtuous woman (xxxi, 10–39) in which the initial letters of the verses follow the exact order of the Hebrew alphabet.[1]

2. Probable Authorship and Date. As the early Fathers were not aware of the differences with respect to contents and form which have just been briefly pointed out between the various collections embodied in the present book of Proverbs, they naturally ascribed the whole work to Solomon. This they did all the more readily because, besides following implicitly the inscriptions in i, 1; x, 1; xxv, 1, which bear direct witness to the Solomonic authorship of large collections of proverbs, "they were misled by the Greek rendering of the titles xxx, 1; xxxi, 1,"[2] which does away altogether with the references to Agur and Lamuel as authors distinct from Solomon.[3] The ecclesiastical writers of the West who came after them had indeed, in the Vulgate, a more faithful rendering of the original titles, which might have suggested to them the non-Solomonic authorship of the sections ascribed to Agur and Lamuel. But preoccupied as they were by the testimony of the titles in Prov. i, 1; x, 1; xxv, 1, which repeatedly spoke of Solomon as the author, and also by what had been the universal opinion of

[1] The Hebrew epithet applied to the woman described in this alphabetical poem can hardly be rendered by a single English word; it denotes "*goodness* as including probity and housewifely capacity" (Toy, loc. cit., p. 243).

[2] Abbé H. Lesêtre, Introduction à l'Ecriture Sainte. vol. iii, p 402.

[3] Cfr. H. B. Swete, the Old Test. in Greek, vol. ii, pp. 463, 467 (Cambridge, 1891).

Digitized by Google

the earlier Fathers, they interpreted the words *Agur* and *Lamuel* as symbolical names of Solomon. This interpretation was no doubt incorrect,[1] but it is no less sure that it contributed powerfully to keep alive the view that Solomon was the author of the whole book of Proverbs. At the present day, very few scholars indeed would attribute the whole work to Solomon, while an equally small number of critics would deny positively that some at least of the maxims included in the book of Proverbs go back to that Hebrew monarch. In like manner the non-Solomonic authorship is generally granted with regard to the alphabetical poem concerning the *virtuous woman* which is appended to the whole collection. Again, most scholars,[2] taking notice that the minor collections ascribed to "the wise" (xxii, 16–xxiv, 22; xxiv, 23–34) are denied to Solomon by their titles no less than the collections ascribed to Agur and Lamuel, and further that the same collections are in the form of quatrains differently from the collections attributed to Solomon, have come to the conclusion that xxii, 16–xxiv, 22; xxiv, 23–34 should not be considered as Solomon's work.[3] It seems, therefore, that the questions of authorship and date are naturally narrowed down first to those regarding the collections which are ascribed to Solomon by their titles, and secondly to those regarding the completion of the whole book of Proverbs.

In reference to the Solomonic collections of Proverbs—as indeed in reference to the Davidic collections of Psalms—the easiest way to dispose of the questions of date and authorship is simply to abide by the titles which are pre-

[1] This is clearly shown by H. LESÊTRE, le Livre des Psaumes, p. 24 sqq. See also CORNELY, Introd. Specialis, vol. ii. part ii, p. 148 sq.

[2] Among them may be mentioned such Catholic writers as LESÊTRE, HERBST-WELTE, SCHOLZ, etc.

[3] For other arguments against the Solomonic authorship, see H. LESÊTRE, loc. cit., p. 21. The probable date of the non-Solomonic collections will be given in connection with that of the completion of the whole book.

Digitized by Google

fixed to them. Acting in this wise, many scholars still regard the maxims in i–ix; x–xxii, 16; xxv–xxix as the work of Solomon, and assign those collections to the period before the Exile. Most critics, however, distrustful of the titles, have looked carefully into the contents of the Solomonic collections to find data whereby to test the value of the inscriptions and determine the probable authorship and date of those antique collections should the titles prove unreliable. Their principal conclusions are briefly as follows:

The opening title: "Mishle Sh^e^lomo, the son of David, king of Israel," is certainly incorrect if taken strictly as ascribing the entire book to Solomon, for, as granted on all hands, the minor collections are not the work of that Hebrew monarch. And yet it is difficult to understand this general title as not applying to the whole book, since it is immediately followed by a few verses (i, 2–6) the obvious purpose of which is to set forth the aim and importance, not of one particular collection, but of the various collections making up the book of Proverbs. It has been argued, it is true, that this opening title stood at the head of the collection comprising i, 7–ix before it was prefixed to the whole book, and that consequently at its primitive place it simply ascribed to Solomon the authorship of i, 7–ix. But this supposition, however plausible it may have appeared to many, rests on no distinct piece of evidence; and further, scholars who do not choose simply to abide by the title are well-nigh unanimous in declaring that such an inscription, when confronted with the contents of i, 7–ix, is inaccurate.[1] "The didactic tone of i, 7–ix," says Samuel Davidson,[2] "with its strict admonitions respecting chastity, do not suit

[1] In this connection Prof. DRIVER says advisedly: "Chap. i–ix is not stated to be Solomon's; and in fact both its style and contents point to a date considerably later as that at which it was composed" (Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 406).

[2] Introd. to the Old Testament, vol. ii, p. 325 sq. See also CHEYNE, Job and Solomon, chaps. v, vi.

Digitized by Google

a king so well as a prophet or priest. Various parts do not resemble the precepts of one who kept a royal harem and was the fruit of adultery with Bersabee, as v, 18, etc., vi, 24, etc., vii, 5–23, except he had repented. Occasionally the writer speaks like a man occupying the condition of a citizen, for instance vi, 31.[1] A few local references to Jerusalem (i, 21 ; viii, 3), and perhaps mention of the new moon (vii, 20), show that the levitical worship was observed.

"The same tone of theocratic purity which appears in x–xxii, 16 did not exist when these proverbs were written. The kingly office no longer corresponded to its ideal. . . . We must therefore date this section (i, 7–ix) subsequently to the reigns of Solomon and David . . . at a time when the proverbs had become more rounded and developed."

In like manner "the personification of wisdom (in chaps. i–ix) marks the highest point to which Hebrew thought on the world rose, and cannot belong to an early age. It is scarcely conceivable except at a time when the operations of the wise had been long pursued. Wisdom, pausing in the work of expounding Providence and the laws of human happiness, which she had long instinctively pursued with self-forgetful fascination in her task, becomes self-conscious, and, turning her eyes upon herself, displays her own graces and beauty before the sight of men. A philosophy of wisdom has now been reached. These facts point to a time not very long anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem. . . . With this agrees the language of the section (i, 7–ix), which, though generally good, has several marks of a somewhat late age, for instance the frequent formation of abstracts in *-uth*."[2]

Finally, it has been suggested, not without some probability, that the fact of a new inscription heading x, 1–xxii,

[1] Cfr C. H. Toy, the Book of Proverbs, p. 140.
[2] A. B. Davidson, art Proverbs, in Ency. lop. Britannica, 9th edit

Digitized by Google

16, and ascribing it to Solomon, implies that the preceding collection is not the work of that monarch.

Be this as it may, the title *Mishle Sh^elomo*, which is prefixed to the Solomonic collection in chaps. x–xxii, is not considered by critics at large as more reliable than the same title at the beginning of the book of Proverbs. They appeal to the contents of that collection, and apparently not in vain, as proving (1) that the state, religious and moral, of society described therein is not that of Solomon's time;[1] (2) that the writer speaks just like a private citizen;[2] (3) that the king, being spoken of in the third person and in a favorable manner, can hardly be King Solomon; (4) that the repetitions—in whole or in part—of the same saying, noticed in this collection, point to minor anterior collections, and to a long circulation before such varying forms were assumed by a proverb,[3] etc.

The title to the last Solomonic collection (xxv–xxix) reads as a definite historical statement: "These also are *Mishle Sh^elomo*, which the men of Ezechias copied out." On that account it is oftentimes said that it must have a historical basis, and so careful a scholar as Driver[4] writes: "The title (xxv, 1) the accuracy of which there is no reason to question." Could we rely absolutely on that heading, we would not only be made aware of the existence of literary activity in the time of King Ezechias (727–698 B.C.),[5] but also of the fact, much more important for our present purpose, that the collection made up of chaps.

[1] The theology of chaps. x–xxii, 16 presupposes the higher teaching of the prophets, the practical extinction of polygamy, etc.

[2] Cfr. xvi, 10, 12-15; xix, 12; xx. 2, 26, 28; xxiii, 1–3.

[3] A. B. DAVIDSON, art. Proverbs, in Encyclop. Britannica; CHEYNE, Job and Solomon, p. 133, etc.

[4] Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 407.

[5] It is worthy of notice that the Chronicler mentions no such literary activity in Ezechias' time, though one might expect a mention of it, if the title in Prov. xxv, 1 lay before him.

Digitized by Google

xxv–xxix was even then a supplement to a Solomonic collection already in existence, and which we may reasonably presume to have been that which now stands close to it in the present arrangement of the book. In reality most contemporary critics reject the testimony of the title (xxv, 1) for the same reasons which induce them to reject the Solomonic authorship of chaps. xx–xii, 16. To those reasons, however, they add two worthy of special mention. First, "many of the proverbs in this collection (xxv–xxix) are mere repetitions, with slight variations, of some which occur in the previous section. Compare, for example, xxv, 24 with xxi, 9; xxvi, 13 with xxii, 13; xxvi, 15 with xix, 24; xxvi, 22 with xviii, 8; xxii, 13 with xx, 16; xxvii, 15 with xix, 13; xxvii, 21 with xvii, 3; xxviii, 6 with xix, 1; xxviii, 19 with xii, 11; xxix, 22 with xv, 18, etc. We may infer from this that the compilers of this section made use of the same sources from which the earlier collection was derived."[1] In the second place, "the antithesis between the righteous and the wicked, and the qualities assigned to them, remind us of post-exilic psalms, and the references to the Law suggest a post-exilic date."[2]

Having thus disposed of the titles of the Solomonic collections, critics endeavored to describe the probable stages through which the principal collections in the book of Proverbs passed before reaching their present arrangement, and to assign to the collections themselves an approximate date. The conclusions most commonly accepted among them, at the present day, are briefly as follows:

(1) The oldest collection—the title of which, *Mishle Sh^elomo*, was later transferred to the whole book—is made up of chaps. x–xxii, 16. From its contents many would assign

[1] William A. Wright, art. Proverbs (book of), in Smith, Dict. of the Bible, vol. iii, p. 2611 (Amer. Edit.).

[2] W. H. Bennett, a Biblical Introduction, p. 155. For further information see Cheyne, Job and Solomon, chap. iv; Toy, the Book of Proverbs, p. xxvii sqq.; etc.

Digitized by Google

its formation to the best days of the Hebrew monarchy, about the eighth century B.C. It is generally considered as presupposed by i, 7–ix.[1]

(2) The first section to be added to this oldest collection was apparently i–ix. Many scholars would place it shortly before the Exile, about the same time chaps. xxii, 17–xxiv, 22 were appended, so that this first book of Proverbs —as it may be called—was thereby supplied with an Introduction and a Conclusion.

(3) At a somewhat later date—hardly before the Exile—chaps. xxiv, 23–34 were placed as a second appendix to the first book of Proverbs, as may be inferred from the fact that it has for its heading: "These *also* are Words of the Wise," instead of having its short contents simply embodied in xxii, 17–xxiv, 22, which has for title "The Words of the Wise." About the same date chaps. xxv–xxix were added after xxii, 17–xxiv had been attached to x–xxii, 16, otherwise these additional *Mishle Shᵉlomo* would have followed directly xxii, 16.

(4) Scholars at large regard as added at a still later date, and as decidedly post-exilic, the last three sections (xxx; xxxi, 1–9; xxxi, 10–31) of the book of Proverbs.

As data are absolutely wanting in regard to the author of the whole compilation and the precise circumstances under which it was carried through, contemporary critics do not venture an opinion on these difficult topics.[2] It remains probable, however, according to W. H. Bennett,[3] that "Proverbs, as the national storehouse of proverbial wisdom, would receive additions as long as Hebrew was a living language, or at any rate till some edition of it had been current long enough to receive a canonical status.

[1] Prof. A. B. DAVIDSON argues that the oldest proverbs are embodied in chaps. xxv–xxix (art. Proverbs, in Encycl. Br.tannica).

[2] Cfr. Abbé J. B. PELT, Histoire de l'Ancien Testament, vol. ii, p. 66 sq.

[3] A Biblical Introduction, p. 152.

Digitized by Google

The production of a new collection of proverbs in Ecclesiasticus instead of an enlarged edition of our book shows that the latter was completed some time before B.C. 200."

3. Literary Analogy between the Book of Proverbs and the Psalter. There are close analogies between the literary features of the book of Proverbs which have been described and those of the Psalter. Each of these inspired writings is manifestly a collection of collections provided with distinct headings. As the Psalter contains two earlier collections ascribed to David, separated by Psalms bearing the name of other authors, so the book of Proverbs comprises two earlier collections with the title "Solomon," separated by proverbs entitled "Words of the Wise." In regard to the Psalter the tendency was to refer to David the complete hymn-book of the Jews, because that monarch was the typical representative of the psalmody of Israel, so with regard to the book of Proverbs the tendency was to ascribe the complete work of gnomic poetry to King Solomon, the typical representative of Hebrew wisdom.[1] In connection with both the Psalter and the book of Proverbs the style and contents have gradually led scholars to give up the testimony of the titles which attributed certain collections in the one case to David, and in the other to Solomon. As the Davidic collections of Psalms do not contain exclusively hymns composed by David, but also Psalms belonging to a much later date, so in like manner the Solomonic collections of *Mashals* do not include simply maxims going back to Solomon, but also aphorisms belonging to a much later period.[2] As the num-

[1] Cfr. III Kings iv, 29-34.

[2] The Fathers of Trent in their enumeration of the sacred books of the Old Testament preferred the expression "Psalterium Davidicum" to "Psalterium Davidis," used by the Council of Florence, because the latter seemed to convey too explicitly the idea that David is the real author of the whole collection. The same Fathers of Trent called the book of Proverbs simply "Parabolæ" instead of "Parabolæ Salomonis";

Digitized by Google

ber of the Psalms really written by David cannot be defined, so likewise that of the proverbs truly composed by Solomon cannot be given with anything like certainty. Both the Psalter and the book of Proverbs passed through several stages in their formation, contain post-exilic elements, and were completed by an author and at a date which must ever remain unknown. The Psalter is not the collection of the whole lyrical poetry of Israel; neither is the book of Proverbs a complete collection of the gnomic poetry of the chosen people. Finally, the repetitions of Psalms or parts of Psalms in separate collections of the Psalter have their counterpart in the repetitions of maxims, in whole or in part, in different collections of the book of Proverbs.

the name of Solomon is also omitted from the title in the official Vulgate, which has "Liber Proverbiorum quem Hebræi *Misle* appellant."

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER V.

ECCLESIASTES.

- **I. NAMES AND PLACE IN THE CANON:**
  - 1. Names in
    - the Hebrew Bible: Qoheleth (Its Probable Meaning).
    - Septuagint and other Versions.
  - 2. Place in the Canon of Jews, of Christians.

- **II. CONTENTS AND OBJECT:**
  - 1. Chief Contents:
    - Prologue (i, 1–11).
    - 1st Part (i–vi): The good and bad things of the World equally vanity.
    - 2d Part (vii-xii, 8): Practical Exhortations.
    - Epilogue (xii, 9–14).
  - 2. General Object (inculcates the moderate enjoyment of life's good things as God's gifts).

- **III. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE.**
  - 1. The Traditional View:
    - Statement (Solomon the author, more likely in his old age, and repentant).
    - Grounds (The Title; Tradition, constant and invariable; Linguistic Features).
    - Improbability (Principal Difficulties).
  - 2. The More Recent Theories:
    - Origin and Gradual Admission by Unbiassed Scholars.
    - Grounds:
      - Statements in Prologue and Epilogue.
      - Appeals to Contents and Linguistic Features of the Body of the Work.
  - 3. Author and Precise Date Unknown.

- **IV. THE INTEGRITY OF THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.**

Digitized by Google

reckoned among the Five Rolls or M^e^ghilloth, and placed between Ruth and Lamentations. It seems, therefore, that the place assigned to Ecclesiastes by the Talmudists was fixed with reference to its Solomonic authorship, while its insertion at a later date among the M^e^ghilloth was due to the fact that, like the other Four Rolls (Canticle of Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther), it was solemnly read once a year in the Jewish services. Its public reading is still obligatory among the Jews for the annual Feast of Tabernacles.[1]

In the Christian lists of the sacred books of the Old Testament the book of Ecclesiastes is given between Proverbs and Canticle of Canticles. This order does not come directly from the ancient arrangement in the Hebrew Text, to which, as stated above, the Talmudic tradition bears witness, but from that in the Septuagint Version, which was the primitive Christian text of the Old Testament and which had preserved the oldest order known to us.

§ 2. *Chief Contents and General Object.*

1. Chief Contents. The book of Ecclesiastes opens with the Title: "The words of Qoheleth, son of David, king of Jerusalem" (i, 1), and a short Prologue (i, 2–11) stating briefly the general conclusions reached by Qoheleth: "All things are vanity," and all human efforts can achieve nothing permanent in the world.

In the body of the work (i, 12–xii, 8) the writer recounts his experiences, identifying them with those of Solomon, the wise and powerful king of Israel. The first part (i, 12–vi) is, as we might say, theoretical, being devoted chiefly to show how the good and bad things of the world

[1] Cfr. H. E. Ryle, the Canon of the Old Test., p. 229 sqq.; Chas. H. H. Wright, loc. cit., p. 452 sq.

Digitized by Google

are equally vanity. Wisdom is vanity, for increase of knowledge means an increase of dissatisfaction and perplexities (i, 12–18). Kingly estate, enjoyments, and luxuries are vanity, as bringing no enduring satisfaction (ii, 1–11). It is true that wisdom is better than folly, but the end of the wise and the fool is alike, so that the advantage of wisdom over folly is short-lived (ii, 12–17). Riches, though gathered by toil, are little worth, for none can tell who will inherit them (ii, 18–23). Better it is, therefore, for man not to strive hard after such fleeting goods, but rather "to eat and drink" and enjoy such pleasure as God provides for him (ii, 24–26).

As the good things of the world are vanity, so is it also with its evil things. Man's shortsightedness and powerlessness before God, the Disposer and Arranger of all things, should convince him that it is better simply "to eat and drink" and enjoy the present (iii, 1–15). Injustice prevails in the world, and there is no remedy for it, man's fate being like unto that of the beast (iii, 16–22); man is irremediably oppressed by his fellow (iv, 1–3); jealousy, isolation, popular discontent, formalism in religion, avarice, are also widespread and unavoidable evils; and in all these occurrences the best thing to do is "to eat and drink," and enjoy whatever pleasure God provides for man during the brief span of life which is his lot (iv, 4–v). All the more so, because abundance of good things if not enjoyed is the greatest evil (vi).

The second part of the book (vii–xii, 8) is chiefly made up of practical exhortations. After a group of proverbs (vii, 1–6) concerning things to be preferred by man, the Preacher recommends patience and wisdom in adversity (vii, 7–14); insists on the importance of keeping "the middle mean," and on the practical advantages of wisdom (vii, 15–24); cautions all against the wicked woman, who usually

Digitized by Google

proves a terrible snare to men (vii, 25–29); describes the benefit of Wisdom in the days of oppression and doubt (viii, 1–15; reverts to the thought of human ignorance and powerlessness (viii, 16–ix, 2); speaks in gloomy terms of the fate which awaits all, and the state of the dead, and exhorts man to enjoy the good things of this world, which are his portion (ix, 3–12). A little parable proving the utility of wisdom is given without comment in ix, 13–16, and is followed by a collection of proverbs on the value of wisdom and the results of folly, and on the misery of a land cursed with a foolish king (ix, 17–x, 20). Exhortations follow to labor in spite of uncertainty as to results, and to make the most of youth, before advancing years deprive man of his various faculties (xi, 1–xii, 8).

The book closes with an Epilogue (xii, 9–14) describing Qoheleth as a wise man who spoke and wrote to impart wisdom, counselling implicit trust in the sayings of the "wise," and concluding with the one great precept of Hebrew wisdom, "Fear God, and keep His commandments."[1]

This Epilogue clearly connects the book of Ecclesiastes with that part of the Old Testament which, from its general object, is known under the name of the "Wisdom Literature." It looks upon all the contents of that sacred writing, however varied and disjointed they may appear to us, as making for the same general purpose, viz., that of giving lessons whereby the reader will be enabled to lead a quiet, honorable, and happy life in this world. As is well stated by E. Philippe,[2] "Ecclesiastes aims at showing that man's happiness in this world consists in the fear of God and the fulfilment of His commands while enjoying moderately the good things which He has placed at his disposal." To this end, Qoheleth describes and criticises the erroneous ways usually followed

[1] Cfr. Job xxviii. 28.
[2] Art. *Ecclésiaste* (le livre de l'), in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible.

Digitized by Google

by men in their pursuit after happiness. Without being in the worst sense sceptical, pessimistic, or materialistic,—as he has been said to be,[1]—he shows the vanity of a presumptuous desire for increased knowledge on account of the limitations of man's intellectual power; that of an insatiable pursuit of this world's goods because of the uncertainty with which even their possession is surrounded; that of the excessive fear of death by pointing out the resemblance between man's death and that of beasts, and insisting on the oblivion into which the best-known name soon falls after death, and the dismal condition of the shadowy existence which was then regarded as the common fate of mortals in the Sh°ol. "It is vanity to consider one's self able to heap up treasure and preserve possessions, since all things must needs alternately appear and disappear, since nothing is permanent save what refers to God, and since true wisdom consists in the fear of God and the keeping of His commandments. Far better it is for man to enjoy life and fear God than to frame theories, however plausible, concerning the mysteries of the world. By the best efforts of his mind he can obtain nothing but a superficial view of the universe, and can in no way subject outward objects to himself or find rest in their possession. On the other hand, through the enjoyment of life with the fear of God, even though this enjoyment is a fleeting one, he secures for himself that amount of quiet, peace, and happiness which the supreme Dispenser and Arranger of the world has intended he should enjoy."[2]

[1] For an examination of these objections against Qoheleth's doctrine, see Abbé A. MOTAIS, Salomon et l'Ecclésiaste; Card. MEIGNAN, Salomon: son règne, ses écrits; C. H. H. WRIGHT, Ecclesiastes in relation to Modern Criticism and Pessimism; VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii. no. 852 sqq.; etc., etc.

[2] Bp. Hanneberg, Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 402 (French Transl.).

Digitized by Google

§ 3. *Authorship and Date.*

1. The Traditional View. The commonly received view among Catholics in regard to the authorship and date of Ecclesiastes is the time-honored position which maintains that this sacred writing goes back to the Solomonic age. According to this traditional view there is no doubt that Solomon composed the book of Ecclesiastes, and there can be question only as regards the period of his reign as the precise time at which he penned its various contents. Moreover, the opinion more commonly received among Catholic writers concerning the period of Solomon's life to which the composition of Ecclesiastes should be ascribed holds that it is the time when the son of David had already tasted all the pleasures of the world and realized their vanity. It is also supposed, though less generally taken for granted, that this work of Solomon's declining years was inspired by God after the great monarch had repented of his various sins.

The first argument usually brought forward in favor of the Solomonic authorship is drawn from the very title of the book: "The words of Qoheleth, the son of David, king in Jerusalem."[1] In this inscription Solomon is not indeed explicitly mentioned, but he is certainly intended under the name of "Qoheleth." He is the only one of David's sons who reigned in Jerusalem, and the things attributed to Qoheleth in the book of Ecclesiastes agree too well with what is told of Solomon in the third book of Kings to allow us to think that any one else is intended. Like Solomon, Qoheleth excels all his predecessors in wisdom (Eccles. i, 16; xii, 9; III Kings iii, 12), and set forth many proverbs (Eccles. xii, 10; III Kings iv, 32). The description of Qoheleth's state (Eccles. ii, 1–20) corresponds with

[1] Ecclesiastes i, 1.

Digitized by Google

that is recorded of Solomon in III Kings x; while his unfavorable experience of women (Eccles. vii, 27) is just what might be expected from the same monarch (III Kings xi, 1–10.)[1] Lastly, even the word Qoheleth, though it is not the personal name of Solomon, was prefixed to the book of Ecclesiastes as most suggestive by its meaning ("one who calls or addresses an assembly") of the great son of David who, in the days of his wisdom, assembled the people of God and bade them to be faithful to His service (III Kings viii, 1, 2, 5, 55–61).

This interpretation of the title is powerfully confirmed by the unquestionable tradition of Jews and Christians, who have always regarded Solomon as the author of the book of Ecclesiastes. As we have already stated, the place between the Solomonic writings of Proverbs and Canticle of Canticles which the Talmudists assigned to Qoheleth in their list of the sacred books, and which was certainly its primitive place,[2] is an indirect but strong proof of the ancient belief of the Jews in the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes. It was because Solomon was considered as identical with Qoheleth that the doctrine of Ecclesiastes objected to in several particulars by Jewish doctors belonging to the school of Shammai was declared justified in the second Hebrew synod at Jamnia (118 A.D.), and that the book itself was maintained among the inspired writings.[3] The Talmudic and Massoretic interpreters have always believed in the Solomonic authorship of the book,[4] and modern rabbis are practically unanimous in holding the same view.

Ancient Christian tradition naturally reflects the tradition

[1] Cfr. Abbé MOTAIS. Salomon et l'Ecclésiaste, vol. ii, p. 38 sq.; Prof. G. SALMON, Ecclesiastes, in ELLICOTT'S Plain Introductions to the Books of the Bible, vol i p. 220; Rabbi L. WOGUE, Histoire de la Bible et de l'Exégèse Biblique, p. 63.

[2] This is the place which Ecclesiastes always occupied in the Septuagint Version.

[3] Cfr. T. K. CHEYNE, Job and Solomon. p. 280.

[4] Cfr. Abbé MOTAIS, l'Ecclésiaste, in LETHIELLEUX' Bible p. 4.

Digitized by Google

of the Jews, and it would be a waste of time to give the countless testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers who have admitted the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes.[1] They all agree in regarding Solomon as the writer of the book, and they diverge only as to which precise period of this monarch's reign the composition of Ecclesiastes should be ascribed. Indeed the traditional view held undisputed sway till the first part of the seventeenth century, when the Dutch scholar Hugo Grotius († 1645) ventured to assign critical arguments against the Solomonic authorship of Qoheleth.[2] In so far, then, as the tradition, ancient and constant, of the Jewish and the Christian Church is an argument in favor of the authorship of a book of Holy Writ, to the same extent it testifies in support of the view that Ecclesiastes was written by Solomon.

A third argument often proffered as making for the Solomonic authorship is derived from the linguistic features of Qoheleth. It is claimed, on the one hand, that the style and diction of that sacred book belong to the golden age of Hebrew literature; and on the other hand, that the multitude, variety, and character of the coincidences in style and phraseology which exist between Ecclesiastes and the other (so-called) Solomonic writings (Proverbs, Canticle of Canticles) are more than sufficient to prove that all these works were composed by one and the same author, viz., "the Son of David, who reigned in Jerusalem."[3]

Lastly, the advocates of the Solomonic authorship considered as a point in their favor the lack of agreement as

[1] For references to the work of the individual Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, see Abbé MOTAIS, loc. cit., p. 4 sqq.

[2] Before Grotius, Luther questioned in his *Table Talk* the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes; but in his Latin commentary issued in 1532 he maintained the tradit onal view.

[3] This argument is developed at length by Rev. David JOHNSTON, A Treatise on the Authorship of Ecclesiastes (issued a onymously).

Digitized by Google

to date and authorship which prevails among critics who have given up the traditional view.[1]

Such are the principal arguments which are confidently appealed to by scholars who still regard Ecclesiastes as the work of Solomon. They are, in their eyes, such convincing proofs of the Solomonic authorship that no real difficulty can be raised against them. And yet when examined closely these and other such arguments lose much of their apparent cogency. It is clear, first of all, as well stated by Condamin, S.J.,[2] that "the disagreement among critics in regard to a *positive* point is in no way incompatible with the *denial*, reasonable and fully grounded, of the Solomonic authorship. In presence of certain characteristics in a writing, one may safely say: 'this work is not the product of this or that century'; while he may hesitate, when called upon to assign a precise date to its composition, between several centuries about equally similar or about equally unknown, such, for instance, as those which, in Jewish history, followed the Babylonian captivity."

In the second place, to argue from resemblances in regard to style and vocabulary between Ecclesiastes on the one hand and Proverbs and Canticle of Canticles on the other that these three writings have one and the same author, and that this author is no other than Solomon, will ever appear an unsatisfactory process of reasoning. The resemblances between these three books, according to the verdict of the best Hebrew scholars of the day, are neither striking nor numerous.[3] The Solomonic authorship of the collections which make up the book of Proverbs, even of

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii. no. 844, footn. 1; H. LESÊTRE, Introd. à l'Etude de l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 413, footn 1.

[2] Revue Biblique Internationale, 9e année (Juillet 1900), p. 363.

[3] Of Ecclesiastes, DRIVER says: "Linguistically, Qoheleth stands by itself in the Old Testament" (Introd to the Literat. of the Old Test. p. 473.) See also G. SALMO[illegible], Ecclesiastes [illegible]

Digitized by Google

those which are ascribed to him by distinct titles, is more than doubtful; and the same thing must be said, as we shall see in the next chapter, in reference to the Canticle of Canticles.

Thirdly, any one fairly acquainted with the unscientific manner in which the Hebrews of old were wont to ascribe to their great men of past ages, such as Moses, Samuel, David, etc., literary productions of a later date, and then tenaciously adhered to such an arbitrary view, will not be prone to attach much importance to the Jewish tradition, however ancient and constant, regarding the Solomonic authorship of Qoheleth. Besides, it should be borne in mind that in one passage at least of the Talmud[1] the *writing* of Qoheleth is ascribed, not to Solomon, but to "Ezechias and his college," so that even Jewish tradition does not seem to be consistent with itself in reference to the authenticity of Ecclesiastes. As regards the testimony of Christian tradition concerning such scientific questions as those of authorship, date, etc., it is beyond doubt that it is not infallible, and that, since it simply reflects the opinions of the Jews in those matters, its weight is not greater than that which attaches to the grounds on which Jewish tradition rests.[2]

Lastly, even though the title of the book should be understood as designating Solomon as the author of Ecclesiastes, under the name of Qoheleth, and even though Solomon should be regarded as speaking in the body of that inspired writing, the question of the authorship should not be too confidently affirmed as settled thereby. The deuterocanonical book of Wisdom is also ascribed to Solomon by its title, and it represents that monarch as the speaker of

[1] Treatise *Baba Bathra*, 15a. Cfr. Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, loc. cit., p. 454, and "General Introd. to the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer, p. 30.

[2] See in "Revue Biblique Internationale" (Janv. 1900), p. 30 sqq., very valuable remarks in this connection by Albert CONDAMIN, S.J.

Digitized by Google

the discourses it contains; and yet, as granted by practically all contemporary scholars, Wisdom is not the work of Solomon. The same thing may be, and indeed is, true in connection with Ecclesiastes.[1]

2. The More Recent Theories. As already stated, the first writer who truly departed from the traditional view was the Arminian, Hugo Grotius (De Groot). Living at "a time when it had become customary with Biblical scholars to scrutinize the Hebrew Text more carefully than in past ages,"[2] he inferred from his own study of the original text of Ecclesiastes that the book was not the work of Solomon. "Ego," says he, "Solomonis [hunc librum] esse non puto, sed scriptum serius sub illius regis, tanquam pœnitentia ducti, nomine. Argumentum ejus rei habeo multa vocabula quæ non alibi quam in Daniele, Esdra, et Chaldæis interpretibus reperias."[3] This bold denial of the Solomonic authorship, which was first put forth in 1644, did not then attract much notice outside the circle of the Arminians, who for a considerable time were the only Protestant sect that made much use of Grotius' "Annotationes in Vetus Testamentum." In fact throughout the eighteenth century the traditional view was well-nigh universally received; and it is only with the nineteenth century that Grotius' denial of the Solomonic authorship, together with its general linguistic ground, began to be received with favor. The eminent Catholic Prof. Jahn fully endorsed it, and from that time forth prominent unbiassed scholars, Protestant and Catholic,[4] have in in-

[1] See CONDAMIN, S.J., loc. cit., p. 42 sq.

[2] R. CORNELY, S.J., Introd. in Libros Sacros, vol. ii, part ii, p. 142.

[3] Pref. in Ecclesiast., in *Critici Sacri*, vol. ii, col. 2055 (Francfort, 1695).

[4] Among the Catholic scholars who reject the Solomonic authorship may be mentioned HERBST, MOVERS, VEITH, KAULEN, LOISY, VON HÜGEL, BICKELL; the Jesuits CONDAMIN, ZENNER, PRAT, DURAND, etc.

Digitized by Google

creasing number admitted that Ecclesiastes was written long after Solomon.

The first ground for the non-Solomonic authorship of Qoheleth consists in the very language which is quoted by the defenders of the traditional view in favor of their position. The general title in i, 1: "The words of Qoheleth, the son of David, king in Jerusalem," especially when viewed in the light of i, 12: "I, Qoheleth, was king over Israel, in Jerusalem," seems to have been worded "at a time when Israel had ceased to be looked upon as an independent nation, and when Jerusalem was no longer a royal residence."[1] At that time "Qoheleth, the son of David," whereby Solomon is certainly meant, had long ceased to rule over Jerusalem, so that he could be truly made to speak in the past tense: "I *was* king."[2] In agreement with the same view, Qoheleth says in i, 16: "I spoke with my heart, saying: 'Behold I have become great, and have gathered wisdom above all who were before me over Jerusalem'"; for the passage is naturally considered to have been written at the time when the author could look back to a long line of Jewish kings who had reigned in the Holy City.[3] The fact that the general title of the book is immediately followed by a reference to Qoheleth in the third person: "Vanity of vanities, *said* [or *saith*] Ecclesiastes" (i, 2), points also to a distinction between the writer and Solomon.

This last remark applies likewise to Eccles. xii, 8, with which the book of Qoheleth properly ends, and which is

[1] Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, loc. cit., p. 90.

[2] Despite all assertions to the contrary, the Hebrew perfect in Eccles. i, 12, must be taken as a *past* tense, for the perfect tenses which follow are all used in a past signification. Besides, as well remarked by JAHN (Introd. to the Old Test., p. 495), if the Hebrew perfect were taken as equivalent to the present "I *am* king," verse 12 would make Solomon state "a fact of too much publicity to be mentioned by him."

[3] It is true that some scholars see in Eccles. i, 16 an allusion to the old Chanaanite kings who had lived centuries before Solomon. but such an allusion is hardly probable; none of those rulers, as far as we know, was especially renowned for wisdom (cfr. also Eccles. ii, 7, 9).

Digitized by Google

identical with i, 2. In thus speaking of Qoheleth in the third person at the very close of the book, the true writer seems to conclude, as he has begun, by hinting at an actual distinction between himself and the only son of David who reigned in Jerusalem.

But it is more particularly in the Epilogue[1] that the writer of the book makes himself known as not being the Solomon of history. He speaks of himself as a "wise man," not as an actual king or ruler in Israel. With a view to instruct his contemporaries he has adopted the plan of teaching by means of proverbs, and made use only of such "sayings of the wise" as were really "words of truth," so that his own book is one of the many valuable collections of the maxims of the wise in Israel. Plainly, in thus speaking of himself and his work, the actual writer excludes the possibility of being mistaken for Solomon, who had not been preceded by a series of wise men, and would not be represented as borrowing from them the elements of his own book.[2]

The second proof of the non-Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes is drawn from the contents of the body of that inspired writing. "Qoheleth speaks in the tone of a subject, not of a sovereign. Some passages of which this may be said can be paralleled by passages in the book of Proverbs; but one class of passages is of a special character. Qoheleth complains (iii, 16) that wickedness was in the place of judgment; he tells (iv, 6) how, looking on the tears of the oppressed who had no comforter (for with their oppressors there was power), he deemed it better to be dead than to be alive; twice more (v, 8; vii, 7) he returns to the subject of the tyranny of the powerful and the corruption of the judges; he complains of the bad choice of rulers by the sovereign—'folly set in great dignity, and the rich sitting in

[1] Eccles. xii, 9–14.
[2] For details, see Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, loc. cit., pp. 100–105.

Digitized by Google

low places.' All is written in the tone of a man who looked on bad government as an infliction of Providence, against which it was hopeless to contend, not of one who was personally responsible for the evil he failed to set right as he was bound to do."[1] The king's system of spies, spoken of in x, 20, together with the writer's bitter advice based on it, can hardly be seriously regarded as coming from a king. These and other such complaints against bad government clearly come from one who had himself writhed under a tyrannical yoke, not from "Solomon, who could scarcely complain so bitterly concerning oppressions, the unrighteous acts of judges, and the elevation of fools and slaves to high honors, to the neglect of the rich and the noble, unless he had wished to write a satire on himself."[2]

Nor does it avail in the least, with a view to get rid of this argument, to maintain that the book was composed by Solomon "in his old age, after he had yielded to female influence to trust into unfit hands power which he was not afterwards strong enough to revoke."[3] This is a supposition which has no positive proof in its favor, or rather which goes directly against the obvious meaning of the words of Qoheleth. Still less can it be admitted, in accordance with a widely-received opinion, that the aged Solomon composed Ecclesiastes as an expression of self-condemnation, of penitence for the errors and crimes of his middle life. There is no tangible trace of self-condemnation or of penitence.[4] The writer's "different experiments in search of happiness are recorded as failures, but without shame or

[1] Prof. G. SALMON, Ecclesiastes, p. 222.

[2] Jno. JAHN, Introduction to the Old Test., p. 495 (Engl. Transl.). See also Fr. CONDAMIN's words to exactly the same effect, in *Revue Biblique*, July 1900, p. 359.

[3] G. SALMON, loc. cit. Cfr. George C. M. DOUGLAS, in KEIL's Introduction, p. 518 (Engl. Transl.).

[4] This is so true that some defenders of the Solomonic authorship have thereby been led to think that Ecclesiastes was written before Solomon had given full scope to his sensuality and despotism.

Digitized by Google

repentance; and in particular, not only is the sin of countenancing idolatry, with which Solomon is charged in the book of Kings, not deplored, but no warning against idolatry is given in the whole book."[1]

More decisive still against the Solomonic authorship of Qoheleth is the post-exilic character of the language used throughout that sacred writing. The cogency of this argument has long been admitted by such conservative scholars as Keil among Protestants,[2] and Kaulen among Catholics,[3] and at the present day it is denied only by a few scholars absolutely bent on holding ancient positions however untenable.[4] The post-exilic character of the language of Ecclesiastes is well and briefly described by Driver in the following manner: "Linguistically, Qoheleth stands by itself in the Old Testament. The Hebrew in which it is written has numerous features in common with the latest parts of the Old Testament—Esdras, Nehemias, Chronicles, Esther—but it has in addition many not met with in these books, but found first in the fragments of Ecclesiasticus (Ben-Sira, about B.C. 200) or in the Mishnah (which includes no doubt older elements, but received its present form c. 200 A.D.). The characteristic of the Hebrew in which these latest parts of the Old Testament are written is that, while many of the old classical words and expressions still continue in use, and in fact still preponderate, the syntax is deteriorated, the structure of sentences is cumbrous and inelegant, and there is a very decided admixture of words and idioms not found before, having usually affinities with the Aramaic, or being such as are in constant and regular use in the Hebrew of post-Christian times (the Mishnah,

[1] G. SALMON, loc. cit , p. 222 sq.

[2] KEIL. Introd. to the Old Test., vol. i. p. 518 sq. (Engl. Transl.).

[3] Franz KAULEN, Einleitung in d. heilige Schrift. A. u. N. Testaments, p 272 (3d edit.).

[4] Cfr. CONDAMIN, S.J., loc. cit., pp. 359-362, 376, 377

Digitized by Google

etc.). And this latter element is decidedly larger and more prominent in Ecclesiastes than in either Esther, or Esdras, Nehemias, Chronicles."[1] The detailed evidence has been given by Delitzsch in his German commentary on Ecclesiastes, and although it has been objected to in some few particulars, it has, on the whole, stood the test of criticism. It is to be regretted that the defenders of the Solomonic authorship, as justly remarked by Kaulen and Condamin, S.J., have been satisfied with an offhand treatment of the linguistic argument so ably put forth against the traditional view.[2]

3. Author and Precise Date Unknown. From the foregoing remarks it plainly follows that a writer other than Solomon must be regarded as the author of the book of Ecclesiastes, although this monarch is certainly designated under the name of Qoheleth, and represented as speaking of his own experiments of life in the body of the work. This is simply a literary device identical with the one now universally admitted in connection with the book of Wisdom, and analogous to the one frequently insisted upon by contemporary scholars in reference to the book of Job. "Solomon," says one of them,[3] "is introduced as the speaker in the same way as Cicero in his treatises 'On Old Age' and 'On Friendship' selects Cato the elder as the exponent of his views, or as Plato in his Dialogues brings forward Socrates. Similarly in the literature of the Old Testament the writer of the book of Job introduces into his magnificent dialogue that patriarch and his friends as

[1] Prof. DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 473 sq. See also DRIVER's Use of the Tenses in Hebrew, p. 162 sq (3d edit.).

[2] It has been treated more seriously by Mr. JOHNSTON (the Authorship of Ecclesiastes, Macmillan, 1880); but his handling of the topic is unsatisfactory in many ways (cfr. Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, Ecclesiastes, p 119, and Excursus iv).

[3] Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, loc. cit., p. 118. See also A. S. PEAKE, art. Ecclesiastes. p. 637, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible; etc.

Digitized by Google

speakers." Solomon, the typical representative of wisdom in Israel, and the king of unsurpassed splendor and prosperity, of widest experience of life under its various forms, was rightly chosen by the author of Qoheleth as the speaker whose words would teach most forcibly the failure of all things in the world to satisfy man's craving for happiness.[1] But this in no way binds us to take the writer of Qoheleth to be Solomon, or even a Jewish king. The contents of the book clearly point, not to a monarch, but to a subject in full sympathy with his fellow subjects, yet complaining with caution for fear of the spies by whom he is surrounded; to a wise man who, "from his observations on the course of human affairs, has been taught by his own experience the vanity and vexatiousness of all things and the miseries and calamities of mankind, and who felt in himself the efficacy of those counsels he imparted to others."[2] Of course the name and place of residence of this wise man will ever remain unknown, for the book of Ecclesiastes does not afford any data concerning them.

Positive data are likewise wanting as regards the precise date at which the author of Qoheleth composed his work. Hence it is that, while contemporary critics are practically unanimous in regarding the book as post-exilic, they are divided between two periods posterior to the Babylonian Captivity. Many maintain that Ecclesiastes belongs to the closing years of the Persian period, which came to an end 332 B.C.; while a larger and increasing number of scholars[3] refer its composition to the Greek period, to about 200 B.C. This latter view seems the more probable one, on the fol-

[1] It is by appealing to some such literary device that the author of Ecclesiastes is usually vindicated from the charge of a "pious fraud" (cfr. Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, loc. cit.; E. RENAN, l'Ecclésiaste, p. 7).

[2] Jno JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 495 sq. (Engl. Transl.).

[3] Among them may be mentioned NÖLDEKE, HITZIG, KUENEN, TYLER, CORNILL, DRIVER, WILDEBOER, PEAKE, CONDAMIN, S.J., etc.

Digitized by Google

lowing general grounds: (1) the linguistic features of the book are such as most likely require a date later than the Persian period. "This linguistic argument pleads strongly for such later date, and there is no argument to set against it on the other side";[1] (2) many a passage of Qoheleth[2] is best understood when viewed in the light of the Jewish customs and tendencies about 200 B.C.; (3) a general influence of Greek philosophy, especially upon the eschatological conceptions of Qoheleth, can hardly be denied, and it points to the same late date;[3] (4) it is highly probable that the book of Wisdom was written with a view to oppose certain erroneous interpretations of Ecclesiastes after this latter book had been rendered into Greek and had become sufficiently known among the Jews, and this would likewise suggest about 200 B.C. as the date of its composition.[4]

§ 4. *The Integrity of the Book of Ecclesiastes.*

Few problems of higher criticism are more complex and difficult than the one which concerns the integrity of the book of Ecclesiastes. The divergent views which have been propounded in regard to it are well summed up by W. H. Bennett[5] as follows: "Apart from the first two chapters, the book is, as Cheyne says (Job and Solomon, p. 204), 'rough' and 'disjointed.' 'The thread of thought seems to break every few verses; . . . the feelings and opinions embodied in the book are often mutually inconsistent.' The theories framed to account for these facts may be grouped thus:

[1] A. S. PEAKE, art. Ecclesiastes, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, p. 639; see also CONDAMIN, S.J., Revue Biblique (1900), p. 376.

[2] Cfr. Eccles. iv, 17; v, 1, 2; vii, 16, 17; x, 5, 6, 7; xi, 1, as interpreted by CONDAMIN, loc. cit., p. 375.

[3] Cfr. L. ATZBERGER, die Christliche Eschatologie, quoted approvingly by CONDAMIN, loc. cit., p. 372.

[4] Cfr. Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, Ecclesiastes, pp. 67-72; CONDAMIN, loc. cit., pp. 367-369.

[5] A Biblical Introduction, p. 163 sq.

Digitized by Google

"(1) That the book was written as it stands, and that the lack of coherence and consistency either reflect the uncertainty and varying moods of the author, as in Tennyson's *Two Voices* (thus NOWACK, PLUMPTRE, WILDEBOER), or that the book contains a kind of report of the discussions of a religious academy (TYLER), or that the more sceptical passages are the sayings of an infidel objector, quoted to be refuted.

"(2) That the lack of order is due to an accident to the MS. by which leaves were transposed (BICKELL, who also holds that there are important editorial additions, e.g. all the passages implying authorship by Solomon), or to the fact that iii–xii were compiled from loose notes of the author after his death (CHEYNE, Job and Solomon, p. 204). This view would explain the presence of the collection of proverbs (ix, 17–x, 20).

"(3) That the confusion arises from omissions and interpolations made by editors to correct the sceptical tone of the book (Paul HAUPT).[1] This view is supported by the probable analogy of Job.

"The epilogues, xii, 9–14, especially verse 13 sq., are often regarded as additions (BICKELL, CHEYNE, NOWACK, PLUMPTRE). They certainly read like a subscription by a later hand (cfr. John xxi, 24 sq.), and verse 13 sq. seems to contradict the teaching of many passages of the book. The rejection, however, of this section carries with it that of passages which are considered as notes enforcing ordinary religious views (ii, 26[a]; iii, 17; vii, 26[b]; viii, 12 sq.; xi, 9[b]; xii, 1, 7). The difficulty as to verse 13, sq. is not that its teaching is necessarily incompatible with the rest of the book. . . . But verse 13 sq. is *not* 'the sum of the matter' either

[1] This theory is reconcilable with the Catholic doctrine of Inspiration, provided it be admitted that the book passed finally through the hands of an *inspired* editor. Cfr. Card. NEWMAN'S Inspiration of Scripture in "the Nineteenth Century," February 1884, p. 195 sq.

Digitized by Google

as a summary of the book or of Qoheleth's feelings as to the subject. . . . The simplest theory of the book seems to be the last (no. 3).

"An interesting variety of this theory supposes that the Epilogue was added at the Synod of Jamnia, A.D. 90, to adapt Ecclesiastes for reception into the Canon, and to formally close the Canon of the Hagiographa."

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER VI.

THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES.

- **NAME AND UNITY:**
  - 1. Name
    - in the Hebrew Text, and in Vatican and Ephræmi MSS. of LXX.
    - in the Alexandrian MS. of LXX, the Old Latin Version, the Targum, etc.
  - 2. Unity:
    - Grounds for
      - Identity of personages and characteristic expressions throughout.
      - Difficulty of dividing the book into distinct Idyls.
    - Reasons against
      - Disconnection of principal Parts, and Absence of Real Development in the Poem.
      - Title in Alexandrian MS. of LXX, the Old Latin Version, etc.
- **II. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE:**
  - 1. The Traditional View:
    - Statement:
      - Canticle ascribed indeed to Solomon, but the Exact Period of his Reign left undetermined
    - Grounds:
      - The Title of the Book; Historical Allusions in the Canticle; Diction pointing to the same authorship as that of Proverbs.
  - 2. More Recent Theories:
    - Solomonic Authorship denied on various Grounds.
    - Real Author and Precise Date Unknown.
- **III. PRINCIPAL MODES OF INTERPRETATION:**
  - 1. The Allegorical Method:
    - Its Origin and Gradual Development.
    - Its Grounds and Principal Difficulties.
  - 2. The Literal Method.
    - (A) 'A Dramatic Composition.
      - Two or Three Characters admitted.
      - How far probable?
    - (B) A Compilation of Idyls:
      - Origin and Gradual Admission of this View.
      - Advantages and Difficulties connected therewith.
  - 3. The Typical Method:
    - Notion and Origin.
    - Its Grounds and Probability

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI.

THE CANTICLE OF CANTICLES.

§ 1. *Name and Unity of the Work.*

1. Name. The book which immediately follows Ecclesiastes in our Christian Bibles[1] is called the Canticle of Canticles or Song of Songs. This name—like the Ἆσμα ᾀσμάτων in the Vatican and Ephræmi MSS. of the Septuagint and the *Canticum Canticorum* in the official Latin Vulgate—is a literal rendering of the Hebrew idiom *Shir Hashshirim*, which appears as the title in the Original Text. Its meaning naturally corresponds to that of the expression *Shir Hashshirim*, and must therefore be regarded as equivalent to the *most beautiful* Canticle or Song, for the construction of a noun with its own plural in the genitive conveys in the Hebrew a superlative sense: the Song of Songs means the most excellent Song, in the same way as the Holy of Holies[2] means the Most Holy; the Heaven of Heavens[3] the Highest Heavens; etc.

A second and probably older form of the name is *Canticles of Canticles.* This plural form, which is found as the heading in the Alexandrian MS. of the Septuagint (Ἄσματα ᾀσμάτων), can be traced back to a much earlier date.

[1] In the ordinary printed editions of the Hebrew Text the Canticle of Canticles is placed between Job and Ruth. It is the first of the five Meghilloth, or "Rolls," which are read in Jewish services at certain sacred seasons. The Canticle of Canticles is read at the Passover.

[2] Exodus xxvi, 33.

[3] Deuter. x, 14.

Digitized by Google

Not only was it known to Origen († 254 A.D.) and his contemporaries ;[1] but it was, to all appearances, the title prefixed to the book in the Old Latin Version,[2] and consequently also in the MSS. of the Septuagint, from which the Old Latin translation was made in the early days of Christianity.[3] Again, the reading of such ancient Greek copies —with which that of the Alexandrian MS. may well be connected—naturally suggests a corresponding plural form in Hebrew MSS. anterior to our era. It may also be mentioned, as confirming this last inference, that the Targum on the Canticle of Canticles seems to point to a plural form in its paraphrase of the title of the book, speaking of "the songs and hymns which Solomon uttered."[4]

2. Unity of the Book. It must be readily granted that the form *Shir Hashshirim*, "the Canticle of Canticles," was prefixed to the book to signify the unity of its contents. It was because the various parts of the book were regarded as integrant elements of a practically continuous poem that they were designated under the collective form *Shir*, "Canticle" (in the sing.). And, as might well be expected, the title which had been thus framed contributed powerfully to spread and preserve the view that, differently from the Psalms, for example, the Canticle of Canticles is not made up of disconnected poetical pieces. In fact that view is still the one most prevalent among contemporary scholars,

[1] Cfr. EUSEBIUS, Eccles. History, Book VI, chap. xxv.

[2] That the Old Latin Version read *Cantica Canticorum* is shown by the fact that Rufinus, St. Ambrose, and other Latin writers freely used that title (cfr. H. B. SWETE, Introd. to the Old Test. in Greek, p. 210 sqq ; G. GIETMANN, S.J., in Cant. Cantic., p. 337). The official edition of the Latin Vulgate published by Sixtus V. read *Cantica Canticorum*.

[3] This inference is also grounded on the use of the plural form by Junilius, St. John Damascene, and other authorities, whose Eastern affinities must be admitted (cfr. especially SWETE, loc. cit.).

[4] See also the words of Rabbi JONATHAN, quoted by L. WOGUE, Histoire de la Bible et de l'exégèse Biblique, p. 54.

Digitized by Google

partly on account of the title,[1] partly also for the following reasons: (1) the same persons appear throughout in the same relations: the bridegroom, who is spoken of as a king in i, 3 (Heb., verse 4); iii, 7, 11; viii, 11; the young maiden who is treated as a spouse, and who has her own mother, brothers, vineyard, etc., in i, 5 (Heb., 6); ii, 15, 16; iii, 4; vi, 2, 8; vii, 10; viii, 2, 8, 12, 13; the daughters of Jerusalem, in i, 4 (Heb., 5); ii, 7; iii, 5; v, 8, 16; viii, 4; (2) the same characteristic expressions and images are found in all the parts of the poem: the bridegroom is compared to a "roe or a young hart," ii, 9, 17; viii, 14; he feedeth his flock among the lilies, ii, 16; iv, 5; vi, 2; the daughters of Jerusalem are adjured in the same words, ii, 7; iii, 5; viii, 4, and they call the bride "the fairest among women," i, 7 (Heb., 8); v, 9; v, 17 (Heb., vi, 1); the interrogative forms are identical throughout, iii, 6; vi, 9; viii, 5; *sh* is always used in the poem instead of the full relative particle *'ăsher*; etc.;[2] (3) if the Canticle of Canticles was made up of a few idyls loosely strung together, it should be easy to distribute the work into its several parts; in reality, scholars who have attempted this distribution have signally failed in reaching anything like a fair amount of agreement among themselves, which shows that the book is a unit the various elements of which cannot be severed except through arbitrary analysis.

It can hardly be denied that, despite these and other more or less plausible arguments in favor of the unity of the Canticle of Canticles, scholars in increasing number admit the composite character of its contents. They are

[1] Cfr. Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii, p. 420; KEIL, Introd., vol. i, p. 504 (Engl. Transl.); R. CORNELY, *Introductio*, vol. ii, part ii, p. 184; etc. Of course, if the title had been prefixed by the very author of the book, as is affirmed by Cornely (loc. cit.), it would at once establish the unity of the book; but the genuineness of the title is neither proved no: probable, as is rightly admitted by Abbé J. B. PELT, Rabbi L. WOGUE, and nearly all recent critics.

[2] For details, see KEIL, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

forcibly struck by the fact, which is indeed granted by many advocates of the unity of the poem,[1] that the various parts of so short a book are disconnected. The absence of a real connection is manifest at ii, 8 ; iii, 1 ; iii, 6 ; iv, 1 ; iv, 8 ; vi, 4 ; etc. Within certain sections, the continuity of which might naturally be expected,[2] there are details tending to disprove a real unity : thus in i, 4 (Heb., verse 5) ; ii, 7 ; iii, 2 ; v, 1 sqq., the scene is in Jerusalem ; but it is in the country in i, 6 (Heb., 7) ; ii, 8 sqq.; etc.; again the speakers are not clearly distinguished : i, 3 (Heb., 4), 7, 8 (Heb., 8, 9) ; ii, 15 ; etc. The general subject-matter of the book is indeed "the mutual love of a bridegroom and his bride" ;[3] but it is not treated with anything like regard for regular succession of ideas and artistic progress, so that no real development is observable throughout the poem. It is not therefore surprising to find that the supporters of the unity of the book disagree both as to its main parts[4] and as to the manner in which the parts should be connected. Yea, more : one of them has felt obliged to confess that "it would almost seem as if the author wrote little pieces, and put them together afterwards," and that "there is ground for the assertion of those who deny coherence and strict unity in the Song" ;[5] while another significantly writes : "Etsi unus est liber et argumento et origine, tamen non est sine ulla intercapedine continuatum, sed quasi separatis de eadem materia carminibus ordinate tamen coagmentatum ; cf. v. g. transitum minime continuum a ii, 7 ad ii, 8."[6]

[1] It is granted by PELT, GIETMANN, S.J., S. DAVIDSON, etc.

[2] Cfr. DE WETTE, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii, p. 536 (Engl. Transl.).

[3] Abbé H. LESÊTRE, art. Cantique des Cantiques, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 186. See also J. B. PELT, Histoire de l'Ancien Test., vol. ii, p. 67.

[4] "Le désaccord le plus complet règne parmi les auteurs qui se sont occupés de diviser le Cantique" (H. LESÊTRE, Introduction à l'Etude de l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 432).

[5] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introduct. to the Old Test., vol. ii, p. 421.

[6] Gerardus GIETMANN, S.J., in Eccl. et Cant. Canticorum, p. 339. Cfr. also J. B. PELT, loc cit., p. 68.

Digitized by Google

In thus regarding the Canticle of Canticles as made up of distinct poetical pieces which all deal with the same general topic, viz., the mutual love of a bridegroom and his bride, the opponents of the unity of the book think that they account sufficiently for the identity of persons, as also of expressions, comparisons, etc., which are appealed to as proving the unity of contents. They also explain in this manner how it came to pass that these distinct songs or parts of songs were gathered together into one book the natural title of which was in the plural form. The reason for which these canticles were made to form one collection consists in the fact that they all dealt with the same general subject; and as they were clearly distinct pieces they received a title in the plural, the existence of which is made known to us through the inscription *Ἄσματα ᾀσμάτων* in the Alexandrian MS. of the Septuagint,[1] the title *Cantica Canticorum*, which was found in the Old Latin Version,[2] and the plural form used in the Aramaic Paraphrase of the Canticle of Canticles. As regards the title in the singular, *Shir Hashshirim* (Canticle of Canticles), it may be easily regarded as the outcome (1) of the fact that the canticles had long formed one distinct book or collection;[3] (2) of the desire to render the contents of the book more acceptable, by describing the collection as "the most excellent song."[4]

[1] The simple title *Tehillim* (Praises) prefixed to the general collection of Psalms suggests, through analogy, the equally simple title *Shirim* (Songs) for the canonical collection of Hebrew songs. The fuller form now found in the Original Text does not appear to be the primitive one.

[2] The formulas "Incipiunt Cantica Canticorum," "De Canticis Canticorum," found frequently in the Roman liturgy, as indeed the plural form "Canticles" in the VI. Article of the Church of England, are probably traceable to the reading of the Old Latin Version.

[3] It is in this way that the Psalter came to bear a twofold title: (1) Tehillim (Praises); (2) Sepher Tehillim (Book of Praises).

[4] The Jewish opposition met by the Canticle of Canticles on the ground of some of its contents was overcome by Rabbi Aqiba through a device of that kind. In the Synod of Jamnia he solemnly protested that "the writings are indeed *holy*, but that

Digitized by Google

§ 2. *Authorship and Date.*

1. The Traditional View. Like the book of Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles is regarded as the work of Solomon by those who implicitly rely on the teaching of Jewish and Christian tradition. This position they hold all the more firmly, because "even those rabbis or heretics of old who denied the sacred character of the Canticle of Canticles nevertheless did not question its Solomonic origin."[1] They therefore think that the only point about which there may be some doubt concerns the precise period of Solomon's life to which the composition of the book should be referred. Many of them, however, consider it far more probable that the Canticle of Canticles was written by the monarch while a youth and as yet innocent; while some add that it may have been composed by him on the occasion of his marriage with the daughter of Pharao.[2]

The first and simplest argument in favor of the Solomonic authorship consists in the full title of the book, as found in the first verse of the Hebrew Text: "Shir Hashshirim, which is Solomon's." In this title the ascription to Solomon is explicit. "It is made by means of the prefix ל (to), as in the superscriptions of the Psalms; and the relative particle *'ăsher* (which) is added in consequence of the article in the preceding expression *Shir Hashshirim*."[3] It is true that this first verse of the original Hebrew is not translated in the official Latin Vulgate, but its ascription of the work to Solomon is sufficiently stated in this heading of the Vulgate: "Canticum Canticorum Salomonis," and is certainly anterior to the Septuagint Version, the various MSS. of which con-

Shir Hashshirim is *holy of holies*." (Cfr. L. Wogue, Histoire de la Bible et de l'Exégèse Biblique, p. 56.)

[1] Cornely, Introd., vol. ii, part ii, p. 196.

[2] Cfr. H. Lesêtre, Introd. à l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 435.

[3] Keil, Introd., vol. i, p. 501 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

tain a rendering of the first Hebrew verse.[1] It is even claimed by some defenders of the Solomonic authorship that the full title of the book goes back to Solomon himself. As it is granted, however, by most critics that the title betrays in many ways its later origin,[2] and in consequence might not be more reliable than the inscriptions of the Psalms, scholars who regard Solomon as the writer of the Canticle of Canticles endeavor by other arguments to show that the traditional ascription to that prince which is embodied in the title is really correct.

They affirm—repeating here, as in many other places, the statements of Keil[3]—that the images used in i, 5 (Vulgate, verses 4, 8); iii, 7 sqq.; iv, 4; viii, 11, and others, show that the writer was at home in the age of Solomon; that the multitude of plants and animals which occur in the book—nuts, aloes, cedar, cypress, vine, mandrakes, rose, camphire, frankincense, myrrh, spikenard, cinnamon, lily, and, again, hinds of the field, lions, kids, doves, leopards, mare, she-goats, young roes, gazelles, ewes, foxes, turtle—as well as of other natural objects and products (ivory, marble, sapphires, etc.)—favor the belief that he was King Solomon, renowned equally as a prolific composer of songs and as an eminent naturalist.[4]

They also urge that the writer speaks of the places he mentions as one who lived before the disruption of the kingdom which occurred upon the demise of Solomon. Thus he draws comparisons from Jerusalem, Thersa,[5] Galaad,

[1] The authentic edition of the LXX by Sixtus V. renders also the full Hebrew title.

[2] For instance, Solomon would hardly have prefixed to his work the laudatory title: "most excellent or beautiful song"; he would hardly have used the full particle 'ăsher for the title, and never in the body of the book, etc., whereas this is very natural on the part of a later title-writer.

[3] Introduction to the Old Test., vol. i, p. 502 (Engl. Transl.).

[4] Cfr. III Kings iv, 32 sq.

[5] Canticle vi, 4 in Hebrew Text. But the reading of the Hebrew Text is hardly defensible (cfr. art. Canticles in Encyclop. Biblica).

Digitized by Google

Hesebon, Mt. Carmel, the Lebanon range, Mt. Hermon, etc., as if they belonged to one and the same kingdom. As a matter of fact, these localities ceased to belong to the same kingdom after the death of Solomon, and Thersa actually became the capital of Jeroboam. Whence it may be inferred that, had the author lived after the disruption, he would have exclusively borrowed his comparisons from places in either the Northern or the Southern Kingdom, according to his own political allegiance.[1]

Lastly, they insist on the beauty of the descriptions, the elegance of the language, as well worthy of the eminent poetical author (Solomon ?) of the book of Proverbs. In fact, according to them, the affinities of diction are so great and numerous between Proverbs and Canticle of Canticles that they may be readily ascribed to one and the same author.[2]

2. More Recent Theories. The foregoing arguments have appeared inconclusive to many scholars of the nineteenth century on some such grounds as the following: (1) the composite character of the contents requires diversity of authorship;[3] (2) the position of the book among the Hagiographa (or Third Canon of the Hebrews) points to a date later than Solomon's time for its composition; (3) "the diction of the poem exhibits several peculiarities (especially in the uniform use of the relative שׁ for אשר, and in the frequent recurrence of many words found never or rarely besides in Biblical Hebrew, but common in Aramaic) which show either that it must be a late work (post-exilic),

[1] Cfr. H. LESÊTRE, art. Cantique des Cantiques, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 186 sq.; CORNELY, loc. cit., p. 196 sq. The latter writer, however is more guarded in his inferences.

[2] Cfr. KEIL, loc. cit.; CORNELY, loc. cit.; etc. Of course Solomon cannot be thought of any longer as the sole writer of the book of Proverbs. (Cfr. CORNELY, loc. cit., p. 142.)

[3] Of course this argument is set forth by those only who deny the substantial unity of the contents.

Digitized by Google

or, if early, that it belongs to *North* Israel, where there is reason to suppose that the language spoken differed dialectically from that of Juda.[1] . . . The title was prefixed at a time when the true origin of the poem had been forgotten, on account of Solomon being a prominent figure in it";[2] (4) the importance attached to rare exotic plants and to garden-cultivation points to Babylonian influence; (5) the mention of Solomon in the third person, both in the title and in the body of the work.

Of these various arguments, the one most frequently insisted upon by the opponents of the Solomonic authorship is that drawn from the striking characteristics of the language of the Canticle of Canticles. In fact they tell us that the more closely it is examined the more it seems not only to disprove the Solomonic authorship, but also to require a post-exilic date for the composition of the book. The linguistic resemblances between the Canticle of Canticles, on the one hand, and Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and other post-exilic works, on the other, point distinctly in that direction. Nor does it avail to appeal to the peculiarities of the Northern dialect to account for those of the Canticle of Canticles, and therefore ascribe that book to the period anterior to the Exile; for although "there is every probability that the language of Northern Israel had dialectic peculiarities, there is no sufficient evidence to establish the unlikely theory that these peculiarities coincided with those of the latest stage of the Hebrew language. These are entirely absent from the one Old Testament document which certainly belongs to Israel, the book of Osee."[3] This

[1] Either supposition plainly excludes direct authorship by Solomon. H. LESÊTRE does not reject absolutely the theory of the compilation of the book *after* Solomon's death. (Cfr. art. Cantique des Cantiques, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 189.)

[2] DRIVER, Introd., p. 448. For philological examination of those linguistic peculiarities, cfr. DRIVER, loc. cit., in footn. to pp. 448, 449; CHEYNE, art. Canticles, in Encyclopædia Biblica, col. 632 sq.; etc.

[3] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 167.

Digitized by Google

view is further confirmed by actual allusions in the book to Greek customs,[1] and by the word *'appiryon* (palanquin) in iii, 9, which is certainly the Greek φορεῖον.[2]

While there is a growing tendency among recent critics to consider the Canticle of Canticles as post-exilic, the divergence among them perseveres undiminished in regard to the approximate date to which the work should be referred.[3] This is due to many causes. There is, first of all, the variety of the contents, some parts of which may be of a more recent date than others. Again, it is difficult to determine the precise time at which certain forms of words or construction were in actual use in post-exilic Hebrew.[4] Lastly, and perhaps chiefly, there is the very imperfect condition in which the original text of the Canticle of Canticles has come down to us, so that the primitive reading of words and expressions having a real bearing on the date of the book is doubtful or positively unknown.[5] For these and other such reasons not only the real name of the author of the poem, but also the precise date of its composition, must remain unknown.

§ 3. *Principal Modes of Interpretation.*

1. **The Allegorical Method.** Among the vexed questions which gather around the Canticle of Canticles must be reckoned that which refers to the subject of the book. A very old view concerning the matter takes the subject to be the mutual love of God and the people of Israel. The Canticle of Canticles is thus regarded as an allegory setting forth the relation between the theocratic

[1] Cfr. i, 11 (Heb., 12); iii, 9, 11; v, 7; viii, 5; etc.

[2] Cfr. DRIVER's reluctant admission in this regard (Introd., p. 450).

[3] The amount of variation is comprised within the early post-exilic period and the second or third century B.C.

[4] Cfr. DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 450.

[5] BICKELL, CHEYNE, BUDDE, HAUPT.

Digitized by Google

nation and its king, in figurative language borrowed from that of a bridegroom to his bride, or of a husband to his wife. The first probable traces of this allegorical method of interpretation are found in the apocryphal writing known as the *Fourth Book of Esdras*, or the *Apocalypse of the year* 97 A.D.[1] "In the Talmud the *beloved* is expressly taken to be God, and the *loved one*, or bride, *the congregation of Israel.* This general relation is expanded into more particular detail by the Targum, or Aramaic Paraphrase, which treats the Song of Songs as an allegorical history of the Jewish people from the Exodus to the coming of the Messias and the building of the third Temple. In order to make out the parallel, recourse was had to the most extraordinary devices; for instance, the reduction of words to their numerical value, and the free interchanging of words similar to each other in sound. Elaborate as it was, the interpretation of the Targum was still further developed by the mediæval Jews; but generally constructed upon the same allegorical hypothesis. . . . The influence of the scholastic philosophy found also an expression in the interpretation of the Canticles in the theory of Ibn Caspi (1280–1340), which considers the book as representing the union between the *active intellect* (intellectus agens) and the *receptive* or *material intellect* (intellectus materialis)."[2]

In was in full harmony with Origen's readiness to set forth allegorical interpretations of Holy Writ in order to get rid of historical or doctrinal difficulties,[3] that this great

[1] Cfr. IV Esdras v, 24-26; vii, 26. These passages of IV Esdras appear all the more probably to contain traces of the allegorical interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles because the writer was contemporary with Rabbi Aqiba, that is with the man who is usually regarded as having set afloat the allegorical view of the book to secure its retention among the sacred writings of Israel.

[2] Thos. E. Brown, art. Canticles, in Smith, Bible Dict., vol. i, p. 378 (Amer. Edit.).

[3] For illustrations of Origen's arbitrary way of allegorizing historical or doctrinal statements of Scripture, see "General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer, pp. 433-435.

Digitized by Google

Christian scholar should adopt, though in a somewhat modified form, the interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles set forth by the rabbis of his time. Like them he excludes, or at least seems to exclude, from the writer's mind all purpose distinct from that of composing an allegory; but, differently from them, he takes the direct subject of that allegory to be Christ and the Church or the soul of the believer. "This little book," he says, "seems to be an epithalamium—that is a nuptial song—written by Solomon, sung in the person of a bride to her bridegroom, who is the Word of God burning with celestial love. For she loved Him passionately, whether we consider her as the soul made after His image, or the Church."[1]

The allegorical method of interpreting the Canticle of Canticles, thus introduced into the Church by the great Alexandrian doctor, has permanently prevailed. Origen's allegorical expositions of the other inspired books were repeatedly shown to be arbitrary, and were in consequence gradually rejected by Christian scholars. But his interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles, though opposed for some time by writers of whom St. Gregory of Nyssa († 396) and Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus († ab. 458), speak only in general terms,[2] and who most likely belonged to the Antiochian school of exegesis, soon became the only one received in the Greek and Latin churches.[3]

As time went on, the allegorical method of interpretation gradually experienced changes in its application. As stated above, Origen and many Fathers after him thought that, in

[1] ORIGEN Comm. in Cant. Cantic. as rendered into Latin by Rufinus (MIGNE, Patr Gr., vol. xiii, col 85.

[2] According to Theodoret, several authors refused to regard the Canticle of Canticles as a spiritual book, and thought that it dealt with the marriage of Solomon with Pharao's daughter, or with Abisag the Sunamitess.

[3] Theodore of Mopsuestia († 429), whose language concerning the Canticle of Canticles was condemned solemnly at the Second Council of Constantinople (553 A.D.), belonged to the School of Antioch.

Digitized by Google

the primary sense of the book, the *beloved* is Christ, the true prince of peace (Solomon), and the *loved one*, or *bride*, is the *Christian Church*, or even the *Christian soul*. But gradually the work was understood of Christ and His blessed Mother; of the union between the Word and Our Lord's human nature in the mystery of the Incarnation; of the union between Solomon and the divine Wisdom; yea, more: of the desired union between the ten tribes of North Israel and the kingdom of Ezechias, etc. Again, various parts of the book have been respectively understood in an allegorical sense of various objects. For instance, Schoefer (Das Hohe Lied, Münster, 1876), refers i–ii, 7 to the union between the Word and the human nature in Christ; ii, 8–v, 1, to the union between Christ and His Church; v, 2–viii, 5, to the union between Christ and the faithful soul; etc.[1]

Interpreters who thus think that the direct and immediate object of the Canticle of Canticles is to describe a spiritual relation in figurative language borrowed from the relation of a bridegroom to his bride, appeal to the following arguments in favor of this distinctly allegorical method of interpretation: (1) many passages of the Old and the New Testament speak of God's relation to His people under the image or allegory of marriage. Thus Ps. xliv (Heb. xlv) is parallel to the Song of Songs; in Osee ii, 19, 20, 23, Yahweh says to the Chosen People: "I will espouse thee to Me for ever"; in Jeremias, ii 2 we read: "Thus says Yahweh, I have remembered for thee the kindness of thy youth, and the love of thy espousals, when thou followedst Me in the desert"; and in consequence Ezechiel (xvi, 8–14) depicts Israel's unfaithfulness to God as an adultery. In like manner, in the New Testament, Our Lord is often spoken of as the Bridegroom, and the Church as His Bride (Matt. ix, 15;

[1] Cfr. H. LESÊTRE, art. Cantique des Cantiques, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible. col. 197 sqq.

Digitized by Google

xxv, 1–13; John iii, 29; Ephes. v, 23–25, 31, 32; II Cor. xi, 2; Apocalyp. xix, 7, 8); (2) as the union between husband and wife is the closest tie existing between creatures here below, it is only natural that God should have caused the sacred writers to use it as a symbol of His union with regenerated men, and to allude to the deepest feelings of the human heart to convey some manner of idea of His ardent love towards the work of His hands. And this is why those holy souls who, in the course of ages, loved God tenderly, grasped, as it were, naturally the meaning of this allegorical book;[1] (3) the allegorical interpretation gives a satisfactory account of the most diverse titles or expressions interchanged by the bridegroom and the bride in the Canticle of Canticles. Jesus Christ is lovely (i, 1); supremely beautiful (v, 10–16); king (iii, 7–11); shepherd (i, 6); enamoured with His Church (ii, 4); etc. The Church is most fair (i, 4; ii, 2; iv, 1–7), and hence an object of jealousy (i, 5); at first "little" (viii, 8), she seeks her divine Spouse (iii, 2, 4); loves Him most tenderly (ii, 5); becomes queen (vi, 7–9), and mother (vii, 3); is persecuted and despoiled (v, 7), etc.; (4) the belief of Jews and Christians in the canonical and inspired character of the book rests on its allegorical meaning.

It can hardly be denied that the foregoing arguments do not prove conclusively that the object of the Canticle of Canticles is purely allegorical. One could grant them all, and yet maintain a form of the allegorical interpretation (the *typical* one, of which we shall treat later) of the Canticle of Canticles which admits a literal sense as the basis of the spiritual meaning. He could still feel at liberty—as indeed "Christian writers have always felt in regard to Ps. xliv" (Heb. xlv),[2] which is an exactly parallel

[1] Cfr. Conceptos del amor de Dios, in "Escritos de Santa Teresa" (Madrid, 1861, vol. i, p. 389), quoted by Abbé H. LESÊTRE, loc. cit.

[2] Abbé C. FILLION, les Psaumes commentés, p. 209 (Paris, 1893).

Digitized by Google

case—to assign to the Canticle of Canticles a twofold sense, viz., the *literal* one, that would refer directly and immediately to the marriage of Solomon with Pharao's daughter, and a higher one (the *mystical*), whereby the union of Christ with the Church would be designated.

But there are greater difficulties which have been urged against the view which regards the Canticle of Canticles as having for its sole object the relation of Yahweh to His people, Israel, or that of Christ to the Church.[1] It has been said, for instance, that neither of these relations is either expressly referred to or even obscurely hinted at throughout the poem, whereas in all similar cases there is something making known to the interpreter who are those (Yahweh and His people, or Jerusalem, etc.) concerning whom a spiritual relation is allegorically described.[2] And it is precisely because the Canticle of Canticles nowhere intimates that it is to be understood directly of a spiritual relation between two well-defined beings that the poem has received so many different allegorical interpretations, none of which could be shown to be exclusively derived from its language.

It is argued, in the second place, that in the Canticle of Canticles "the imagery of love is drawn out into minute details of personal parts and properties repugnant to a devout Jewish mind, and still more to a Western one, if the Supreme Being and His love to Israel be the theme. In this supposition it would be natural to expect the higher, more spiritual aspects of love to be the theme dwelt upon, instead of

[1] These two relations are the only ones which can be seriously claimed to constitute the principal object of the Canticle of Canticles, and consequently the others admitted by some defenders of the allegorical method of interpretation need not be examined. (Cfr. H. LESÊTRE, Manuel d'Introduction à l'Etude de l'Ecriture Sainte, vol ii, p. 429 sqq.)

[2] Cfr. the passages referred to above as describing God's relation to His people, and Christ's relation to His Church, under the image or allegory of marriage. Throughout the Canticle of Canticles there is no mention of Yahweh or of things divine.

Digitized by Google

the sensual as is invariably the case. The individualizing of the book in relation to the affections and emotions of Yahweh exceeds anything found in the Old Testament. Had the poem dealt more in generals, the claim of an allegorical sense would have been more probable, because in greater proximity to like images elsewhere; but taste, propriety, and Scripture analogy are violated by the tedious circumstantiality with which the one idea is unfolded, viz., that God loves His Church and is loved by it. God is a Spirit. There is anthropomorphism in the Scriptures. Passions, in which even human frailty and imperfection appear, are ascribed to the Almighty. But here the imagery exceeds in grossness anything that is written elsewhere. The words put into the mouth of Yahweh grate harshly on the ear and heart of the spiritually-minded." Whence it is inferred that the Canticle of Canticles not only does not intimate anywhere that it is to be understood in a purely allegorical sense, but even contains many passages whose direct application to God, or to the Incarnate Word of God, seems repugnant to the moral sense of the interpreter.[2]

In connection with that distinctly Christian form of the allegorical method of interpretation according to which "the strict, immediate, and principal subject of the Canticle of Canticles is the union of Christ with His Church,"[3] the following difficulty is particularly urged: "It tears away the poem from all historical connections, and makes it to have no special reference to the Old Testament times. Describing prophetically the love between Christ and His Church under the New Testament dispensation, the Jewish character of the book is ignored, and it becomes to all intents a Christian production. The view in question strips it of all real association with the Old Testament dispen-

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii, p. 400.
[2] Of that description are such passages as vii, 1–9; v, 11–16; iv, 1–5; etc.
[3] Abbé H. LESÊTRE, loc. cit., vol. ii, p. 429.

Digitized by Google

sation—a proceeding so unusual and arbitrary as to insure its rejection. No work of the Old Testament is so completely projected into the Christian dispensation as to lose connection with the times and circumstances in which it originated."[1]

2. The Literal Method. In view of these and other such difficulties raised of late against the allegorical interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles, one can understand readily how a decided reaction should set in among contemporary scholars in favor of a different mode of interpretation. In fact the tendency among them is to take the words of the poem in their obvious literal sense. Most of them consider the book as a dramatic poem "with a full equipment of dramatis personæ, lovers, ladies of the harem, first and second citizens, villagers, etc. This theory has been held in different forms, of which these are two chief varieties: (1) The drama depicts the loves of Solomon and one of his queens,[2] the Sulamite, Solomon assuming at times the character of a shepherd. Thus i–iii, 5, courtship; iii. 6–v, 1, marriage; v, 2–vi, 9, domestic difficulties; vi, 10–vii, 9, mutual satisfaction; vii, 10–end, the Sulamite takes Solomon to visit her home and family. According to this view, the dialogue consists chiefly of mutual expressions of admiration and love between the two leading characters. (2) The drama has three main characters, the Sulamite, a shepherd, to whom she is betrothed, and Solomon, who attempts to win her affections. Thus i–vii, 9, the Sulamite, in the harem, combats the persuasions of Solomon and his womenfolk by the help of her reminiscences of her shepherd lover; vii, 10–viii, 4, final rejection of Solomon in favor of the shepherd; viii, 5–14, happy reunion of the Sulamite and

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 395 sq.

[2] This is the theory of DELITZSCH, for a detailed exposition of which see DRIVER Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 438 sqq.

Digitized by Google

the shepherd. According to this view, the book is in praise of pure conjugal affection."[1]

It must be granted that the theory which takes the Canticle of Canticles to be a dramatic composition embodies a very old view of the poem (it goes back to Origen),[2] and has had eminent exponents, chiefly in the nineteenth century. It has also the advantage of interpreting the words of the book in a sense which connects it intimately with the Old Testament times. But more particularly, under its second form, it exercises a special attraction upon scholars anxious to find in the sacred writing a moral purpose worthy of its insertion in the Canon of Holy Writ. The book is then conceived as celebrating "a pure affection, which holds out against the temptations of a court, and rises superior to all the seductive arts even of a monarch," and consequently as "leading men back to simplicity and purity and the law of nature in the relations of men and women."[3]

And yet, under whatever form, the view that the Canticle of Canticles is a drama is hardly probable. There is really no dramatic plot in the book,[4] and it is difficult to conceive of a drama in which each of the actors seems almost, if not quite, uninfluenced by the speeches of the other. The supposition of a dramatic composition is not supported by any parallels in ancient Jewish or even Semitic literature, and a great deal that is admitted by the defenders of either form of the dramatic theory is read, as it were, between the lines, not fairly deduced from the language of the Song of Songs. Again, the difficulties of interpreting the book upon this hypothesis are both numerous and great, and the division

[1] W. H. Bennett, a Biblical Introduction, p. 168 sq. This second view of the dramatic composition is admitted by Adeney, A. B. Davidson, Driver, König, W. R. Smith; Kaempf; Oettli; Bruston; etc.

[2] In Cant. Cant., lib. i. init. ad Cant. i (Migne, Patr. Græca, vol. xiii, col. 3).

[3] A. B. Davidson. on the Song of Songs. in "Book by Book," p. 195 sq.

[4] For an able discussion of this point. see Cheyne in Encyclop. Biblica, art. Canticles col. 686 sqq.

Digitized by Google

of the text between the various personages assumes, quietly indeed, but, all the same, too readily, that textual imperfections in the Canticle of Canticles are far from having the bearing that they really have upon the correct understanding of the entire poem.

For these reasons, among others, the dramatic theory has been steadily losing ground among scholars who favor a literal interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles. Such prominent critics as C. H. Cornill, E. Kautzsch, C. Budde, P. Haupt, etc., have of late come back to an older view of the book, that endorsed by the Catholic scholar Jno. Jahn a century ago. Like him, they admit that "the Canticle of Canticles is made up of several disconnected poems, and that the materials which compose the work are such incidents as were common among the Hebrews."[1] They now look upon it as a compilation of songs originally connected with those marriage-customs which J. G. Wetzstein, for many years Russian Consul at Damascus, describes as still prevalent among the peasants of Syria. In modern Syria, we are told, the first week after a wedding is called "the king's week," because during it the bride and the bridegroom play at being king and queen. The "threshing-board" is turned into a mock throne on which they are seated, while villagers and others sing before them songs among which are found *waṣfs*, or poetical "descriptions" of the physical beauty of the so-called king and queen. The first of these *waṣfs* is sung on the evening of the wedding-day itself, while the bride, brandishing a naked sword, dances in her wedding array. Now, the Canticle of Canticles is a collection of such wedding-songs, the bridegroom being called in them "Solomon" hyperbolically, and the bride being des-

[1] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 485 (Engl. Transl.). Herder's conception of the Canticle of Canticles, though inferior, was similar in several respects to that of Jahn, his contemporary.

Digitized by Google

ignated "the Sulamite," as a term suggestive of the highest beauty.[1]

Several things have contributed to recommend to scholars this recent form of the literal interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles. It is manifestly in harmony with the composite character of the book, and gives what seems to be a plausible account of that literary feature. It connects well the general contents of the poem with Oriental customs handed down from pre-Christian times. But more particularly it assigns a probable meaning to expressions and descriptions which are well-nigh unintelligible in every other mode of interpretation. Indeed it is claimed that the theory can be applied to continuous exposition without overstraining the meaning of the text.[2] Finally, various apparently objectionable passages of the Canticle of Canticles are readily seen to be truly harmless and unobjectionable on the basis of this theory, because they then belong to the class of ancient wedding songs and customs.

The principal difficulties which may be urged against this manner of interpreting literally the Canticle of Canticles are briefly as follows: It seems, first of all, to liken altogether too much that inspired writing to ordinary ancient collections of love-songs, and thereby to divest it of that sacred character which must have been connected with its

[1] Cfr. III Kings i, 3, 4.

[2] This is admitted by so careful a scholar as W. H. BENNETT ("the Critical Review," Jan. 1899, p. 58), in his review of BUDDE's Comment. on Canticles. The principal positions assumed by Budde are as follows: The bridegroom is called King Solomon hyperbolically; the sixty valiant men who surround his litter (iii, 7) are the bridegroom's companions spoken of in Judges xiv, 11; the bride is designated "the Sulamite" to suggest her wonderful beauty (cfr. III Kings i, 3, 4); most of the book is made up of poetical descriptions of love and happiness, not really sung by the bride and the bridegroom, but placed on their lips by the men and women who pay them homage. The *wasf* of the sword-dance is thought to be recorded in vii. 1 sqq.; while the *wasfs* of the following days would be found in iv, 1-6; vi, 4-7; the *wasf* of the bridegroom in v, 10-16 would be sung by the bride. Budde thinks that certain connections were made by the compiler of our canonical collection of songs. (Cfr. CHEYNE, art. Canticles, in Encyclop. Britannica, for details in this regard.)

Digitized by Google

origin, since it found a place in both the Alexandrian and the Palestinian Canons very soon after the probable date of its composition. It has been objected, in the second place, that if the Canticle of Canticles is really a series of distinct poetical pieces, headings to the songs constituting the collection would naturally be expected, whereas, in point of fact, there is not the slightest trace of them even in the LXX, which is the oldest witness to the primitive contents of the book. Again, although this form of the literal interpretation, when tested by a continuous exposition of the poem, does far less violence to the text than the other forms of the literal method of interpretation, yet it can hardly be denied that, time and again, it puts upon the text arbitrary constructions.[1]

3. The Typical Method. There now remains to speak briefly of the Typical mode of interpretation, which in some respects is a middle position between the allegorical and literal methods of understanding the Canticle of Canticles. This theory admits a twofold meaning in regard to the entire book: the one, *literal*, directly yielded by the words of the text; the other, *spiritual* or *typical*, signified by the persons or things to which the words have a direct reference. Those who advocate the typical interpretation generally assume that Solomon's marriage with Pharao's daughter, or with some other, is the historical basis employed to depict the love of God or of Christ to the Church, the real relation of love between the historical Solomon and the Sulamite, also an actual person, being the type of a spiritual relation, according to St. Paul's words regarding marriage: "This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church."[2] But it matters little,

[1] Cfr. C. BRUSTON's criticism of BUDDE's theory, in the "Dixième Congrès des Orientalistes et l'Ancien Testament" (Paris, 1895).

[2] Ephes. v, 32.

Digitized by Google

as far as that system of interpretation is concerned, whether the names of the bride or the bridegroom can be correctly known in the present day: the typical method subsists intact provided a true chaste human love be celebrated in the book and suggest a relation of love which is divine.

The origin of this theory is shrouded in obscurity. The literal sense of the Canticle of Canticles was indeed recognized by Shammai and his school toward the beginning of the Christian era. It may even be inferred with a fair amount of probability that, since his Jewish contemporaries assigned to the writings of the Old Testament generally a higher meaning than the literal sense, that celebrated rabbi admitted a typical, together with a literal, sense in regard to the Song of Songs. Yet, for all this, we have no conclusive proof that the typical method of interpretation can be traced back to him. The literal meaning of the book was soon rejected by the Jewish scholars who came after him, and the allegorical method prevailed among them for ages to come.

It is true also that Bossuet, one of the leading advocates of the typical theory, cites Origen in favor of that mode of interpretation, and that a strong argument for the position of the great bishop might be drawn from a close examination of the words used by Origen in regard to the Canticle of Canticles,[1] as indeed from the manner in which he and the other Alexandrian doctors interpreted allegorically the Old Testament writings.[2] It might thereby be shown how probable it is that the typical method of interpretation can claim in its favor the authority of Origen. It is more probable still that the typical interpretation was admitted by members of the school of Antioch, whose general tendency

[1] Cfr. Abbé GRANDVAUX, S.S., Introd. to "le Cantique des Cantiques," in LETHIELLEUX' Bible, p. 17.

[2] Cfr. General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, by the present writer, pp. 431-435.

Digitized by Google

it was to emphasize the literal, almost to the detriment of the typical, sense of Holy Writ.[1]

It seems, however, that the first distinctly to formulate the typical form of interpretation of the Song of Songs was a mediæval writer, Honorius, a priest of Autun, in Gaul († ab. 1140 A.D.). He maintained that in its literal sense the book refers to Solomon's marriage with the daughter of Pharao, and in its allegorical (typical) sense to the union of Christ with the Church. As the typical sense of the Scriptures was at the time universally admitted, and as the historical Solomon was no less freely recognized as the type of Christ, the view of Honorius was plainly a tenable position, and indeed one that would naturally commend itself to the acceptance of his contemporaries. Nevertheless the typical theory of the Canticle of Canticles won over probably but a few of the mediæval commentators, who were slow to depart from the time-honored methods of interpreting the sacred books, and whose desire for originality in regard to the Song of Songs was satisfied with understanding its text in a direct allegorical sense of the Son of God and of Mary, His Mother.[2] In the sixteenth century the typical method of interpretation was adopted by such eminent Catholic writers as Jansenius, bishop of Ghent (1510–1576); the Dominican Soto († 1560); and the Jesuits Mariana († 1624) and Pineda († 1637); and ever since it has had defenders among both Catholic and Protestant scholars.[3]

[1] It is of these Antiochian scholars that St. GREGORY OF NYSSA and THEODORET speak in general terms as opposed to the allegorical interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles.

[2] For details regarding this point, see Abbé GRANDVAUX, loc. cit., pp. 25–33. "During that period," says significantly Card. MEIGNAN (Solomon, p. 412), "the literal sense was smothered by the overgrowth of mystical meanings."

[3] The leading advocates of this theory are, among Catholics, BOSSUET (1627–1704), the Editors of the Bible of Vatable (middle of the eighteenth century), D[illegible]ET, O.S B. († 1757), Bp. PLANTIER, and some Spanish and Italian writers of [illegible]h century; among Protestants. GROTIUS († 1645), LOWTH († 1787), DELIT[illegible]

Digitized by Google

The general arguments in favor of the typical theory are briefly these: (1) by admitting for the Canticle of Canticles a twofold sense—the one literal, and the other allegorical, or rather typical—it likens that sacred book to the other writings of the Old Testament, in all of which Jewish and Christian tradition has recognized a typical sense more or less explicitly suggested by the literal one;[1] (2) it connects well the Song of Songs with the Old Testament times and customs and typology, for it gives a distinct historical background to the allegorical meaning, and sees in Solomon and his union with Pharao's daughter, as it were, natural types of Christ ("the Lord of Peace")[2] and His most intimate union with the Church, chiefly made up of Gentile races;[3] (3) most of the passages in the Canticle of Canticles which seem to have no direct meaning when understood exclusively of God or of Christ or of the Church,[4] receive a natural, and indeed, when viewed properly, an unobjectionable, meaning when taken as applying directly to a human bridegroom and his bride;[5] (4) the typical theory combines the advantages of both the allegorical and the literal methods of interpretation; by its admission of the literal sense it gives full satisfaction to what has been for many centuries the tendency among Catholic scholars to abide by the natural meaning of the words of a sacred book as setting forth the direct object of the inspired writer; while by its recognition of the typical sense it assigns a distinct reason for regarding the Canticle of Canticles as invested from the first with a sacred character.

It may be added that if, instead of being coupled with

[1] The typical meaning may at times not be suggested at all by the words or the con text of a passage, as is clear from the fact that the plain history of Agar and Sara contains, according to St. Paul (Galat. iv, 22 sqq.), a typical meaning.

[2] II Thessal. iii, 16.

[3] Cfr. Ephes. v, 25 sqq.; etc.

[4] Cfr. vii, 1-9; iv, 1-5; v, 11-15; etc.

[5] Cfr. Bossuet, Præf. in Cant. II.

Digitized by Google

the conception of the Song of Songs as a drama, which is entertained by most advocates of the literal method of interpretation, the typical sense were connected with the view which takes the book as a compilation of idyls, and which is admitted by other defenders of the literal method, the whole theory of the mystical interpretation would be rendered more plausible than it has appeared in the past to those who have examined it closely.[1] The general view of the book that would thereby be obtained is about the one adopted by Cardinal Meignan when he says: "The Canticle of Canticles does not bring forward either a historical hero or an actual heroine. It is made up of a collection of songs which oftentimes assume the form of dialogues and which have for their object the mutual love of a bridegroom and his bride, for the sole reason that this love supplies the most vivid and tender figure of the highest affection, viz., of God's love for mankind, of Yahweh's love for Israel, of Christ's love for the Church, for faithful souls, and for the Virgin Mother."[2]

[1] Cfr. GIETMANN, S.J., loc. cit., p. 371 sqq.
[2] Card. MEIGNAN, Solomon, p. 417.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER VII.

THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

I. TITLE AND CONTENTS:

- 1. Title in
  - the Greek MSS.
  - Ancient Versions and Ecclesiastical Writers.
- 2. Contents:
  - Principal Parts and Leading Ideas pointed out.
  - Their Unity and Integrity.

II. LANGUAGE AND AUTHORSHIP:

- 1. Language:
  - Certainly not Hebrew.
  - But Greek throughout the Book.
- 2. Authorship:
  - Written in the person of Solomon, through Literary Fiction.
  - Philo not the Author.
  - The Real Author unknown.

III. PLACE AND DATE OF COMPOSITION:

- 1. Place:
  - Neither Jerusalem nor Palestine.
  - But Alexandria in Egypt.
- 2. Date:
  - Not before the Septuagint Translation of the Pentateuch and Isaias.
  - Certainly anterior to Philo.
  - Published probably after 117 B.C.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VII.

THE BOOK OF WISDOM.

§ 1. *Title and Contents.*

1. **The Title.** The deutero-canonical book of Wisdom[1] has generally gone by the name of "The Wisdom of Solomon." It is so entitled in the earliest Greek MSS. Thus in the Sinaitic Codex it is called Σοφία Σαλομῶντος; in the Vatican, Σοφία Σαλωμῶνος; and in the Alexandrian, Σοφία Σολομῶντος.[2] Indeed this ascription of the book to the representative of Hebrew wisdom is older than the fourth century, to which the earlier of those MSS. are usually referred; for the Old Latin Version had as a heading to the book "Sapientia Salomonis," while the Syriac translation called it "The Book of the Great Wisdom of Solomon."

As might naturally be expected, this title was freely employed by the Eastern and Western Fathers of the first three centuries. In connection with the book of Wisdom, as in connection with Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticle of Canticles, they relied implicitly on the heading which they found in their Greek or Latin Codices, and generally spoke of "the Wisdom of Solomon" when quoting that inspired writing.[3] It is apparently for the same reason that

[1] In regard to the sacred and canonical character of the book of Wisdom—as also in regard to that of the book of Ecclesiasticus handled in the next chapter—see "General Introd to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer.

[2] Cfr H. B. Swete, Introd. to the Old Test. in Greek (Cambridge, 1900), p. 201 sq. In the *authentic* edition of the LXX by Sixtus V. the title is Σοφία Σαλωμών.

[3] Cfr. H. Lesêtre, Manuel d'Introduction à l'Ecriture Sainte, vol ii, p. 438.

Digitized by Google

most of the Greek lists of the sacred books use the title Σοφία Σολομῶντος during the fourth and following centuries, and that in the Latin Church such weighty authorities as the Councils of Hippo (393 A.D.) and of Carthage (397 A.D.), and the letter of Pope St. Innocent I. to St. Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse (405 A.D.), and many others after them, speak of "the five books of Solomon," whereby they mean Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, *Wisdom*, and Ecclesiasticus. Gradually, however, especially under the influence of St. Jerome, Western writers, headed by St. Augustine, dropped the name of Solomon; and down to the present day the title in the Latin Vulgate is simply *Liber Sapientiæ*.

2. **Contents.** The book of Wisdom has been variously divided, and oftentimes even its minute contents have been framed into a scheme quite foreign to the purpose of the writer.[1] Its principal parts and leading ideas have been well set forth by E. Schürer in the following manner: "According to chap. ix, 7 sqq., Solomon himself is to be regarded as the speaker, and those addressed are the judges and kings of the earth (i, 1; vi, 2). Thus the book is properly an exhortation of Solomon to *his royal colleagues the heathen potentates*. He, the wisest of all kings, represents to them the folly of ungodliness, and the excellence of true wisdom. Its contents may be divided into three groups. It is first shown (chaps. i–v) that the wicked and ungodly, although for a period apparently prosperous, will not escape the judgments of God, but that the pious and just, after having been for a time tried by sufferings, attain to true happiness and immortality. In a second section (chaps. vi–ix) Solomon directs his royal colleagues to his own example. It is just because he has loved high and divine wisdom, and has

[1] Cfr. the various divisions proposed by scholars in CORNELY, S.J., Introduct., vol. i. part ii, p. 212 sq.

Digitized by Google

united himself to her as his bride, that he has attained to glory and honor. Hence he still prays for such a wisdom. The third section (chaps. x–xix) points out, by referring to the history of Israel, and especially to the different lots of the Israelites and the Egyptians, the blessing of godliness and the curse of ungodliness. A long rebuke of the folly of idolatry (chaps. xiii–xv) is here inserted."[1]

Viewed simply in the light of these chief contents, the book of Wisdom seems to be the work of one writer. In fact contemporary critics agree in regarding the work as a literary unit. According to them, not only the same general purpose—that of giving a solemn warning against the folly of ungodliness—clearly pervades the whole book; but it is so carried out that in the treatment of the topic no distinct break can be pointed out. Each section contains the preparation for that which follows, and the clauses which appear at first sight to be mere repetitions of thought really spring from the elaborateness of the structure of that sacred writing.[2] Again, favorite expressions, turns of speech, and single words are found in all sections, so that practical identity of language and style prevails throughout the book.[3] Hence it is thought that, differently from many other writings of the Old Testament, the book of Wisdom is not a compilation of pre-existing documents, with their individualities of style, language, mode of representation, etc.

As in regard to the unity of the book of Wisdom, so in regard to its integrity, contemporary critics are practically at one. They now reject, apparently on adequate grounds, the various attempts that have been made to show that the

[1] Emil SCHÜRER, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, vol. iii, p 230 sq. (Engl. Transl., New York, 1891). See also J. B. PELT, Histoire de l'Ancien Test., vol. ii, p. 392.

[2] Cfr. WESTCOTT, art. Wisdom, The, of Solomon, in SMITH, Bible Dict.

[3] Cfr. Edwin Cone BISSELL, The Apocrypha, in LANGE-SCHAFF, Comment., p. 227 sqq.

Digitized by Google

work has not come down to us in its primitive form. Thus they hold, in opposition to the French Oratorian, C. F. Houbigant († 1783), that the book is not imperfect at the beginning, as if it were simply a fragment from a larger work; in opposition to Dom Calmet, O.S.B., Grotius, Eichhorn, etc., that the work is not mutilated at the end, for chap. xix, 22 is a fitting conclusion to its contents; finally, in opposition to Grotius and Graetz, that there are no traces of interpolation by Christian hands, for it has been shown that the book—when examined without dogmatic prepossessions—contains no doctrine inconsistent with Jewish authorship.[1]

§ 2. *Language and Authorship.*

1. **Language.** The original language of the book of Wisdom is not Hebrew, although the heading, "The Wisdom of Solomon," would naturally suggest that it was composed in the same language as the rest of the works ascribed to Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles). It is true that, in view of that heading, some scholars[2] have endeavored to show that internal evidence points to Hebrew as the original language of the book of Wisdom, and have set forth the Hebraisms,[3] the poetical parallelism, the constant use of simple connecting particles (*καί*, *δε*, *γάρ*, *ὅτι*, etc.), the possible mistakes of translation from the original Hebrew which are noticeable in the Greek Text, as so many distinct arguments in favor of their position. But these reasons, when closely examined, do not stand the test of criticism, and are now universally rejected as insufficient. All that they really prove is that the author of the book of Wisdom was a

[1] For details, see CORNELY, loc. cit., p. 219 sqq.; E. C. BISSELL, loc. cit, p 223.

[2] Among them may be mentioned GROTIUS and HOUBIGANT. The latter, however, confines a Hebrew original to the first nine chapters.

[3] Cfr. for instance, i, 1; ii, 9, 15; iv. 13, 15; ix, 6; etc., etc.

Digitized by Google

Hebrew, and resembled his fellow Jews, who scarcely ever wrote the Greek language in its purity.

Not only are there no conclusive proofs that Hebrew was the original language of the book of Wisdom, but there are direct and convincing reasons for admitting that the entire work was written in the Greek language.

Throughout the book the author betrays a peculiar liking for compound words, particularly adjectives, for which corresponding terms would be sought in vain in Hebrew.[1] Again, throughout the book numerous assonances, plays on words, paronomasias, and oxymora occur and prove the originality of the Greek text.[2] "There are also a multitude of instances where a purely Greek type of expression has been adopted, to which no Hebrew original would have naturally led the way, and which certainly no translator would have been likely to make use of, at least to such an extent (cfr. i, 11, *φείδεσθαί τινος*; ii, 6, *ἀπολαύειν τῶν ὄντων ἀγαθῶν*; iv, 2, *ἀγῶνα νικᾶν*; x, 2, *αγῶνα βραβεύειν*). The author employs, too, current philosophical terms of his time to give expression to philosophical ideas (cfr. i, 4, *ἐνσώματι κατάχρεῳ ἁμαρτίας*; xi, 17, *ὕλη ἄμορφος*; xiv, 3, *πρόνοια*). For these reasons, taken in connection with the general structure and arrangement of the work, its lightness of movement, its philosophical cast, its many marks of Hellenistic culture, the theory of an ancient Hebrew original, or of any original than Greek, is wholly excluded."[3]

2. Authorship. It is plain that, since Greek is the original language of the entire book of Wisdom, the Solomonic authorship cannot be maintained, although this

[1] Cfr. *κακότεχνος* (i, 4; xv, 4); *πρωτόπλαστος* (vii, 1); *νηπιοκτόνος* (xi, 7); etc.
[2] Cfr. i, 1, 10; vi, 6, 22; vii, 13; xvii, 8; xix, 21; etc.
[3] E. C. Bissell, loc. cit., p. 224.

Digitized by Google

authorship was commonly assumed by the early ecclesiastical writers. In Wisdom, as in Ecclesiastes, the one represented as speaking is clearly King Solomon,[1] so that early Christian scholars[2] took it naturally for granted that the title in both books must be correct. It is true that so eminent a writer as St. Jerome denied the Solomonic authorship of the book of Wisdom; but it should be borne in mind that the illustrious Doctor, in calling that book *ψευδεπίγραφον*, thought he was thereby making a point against its sacred and canonical character.[3] Had he considered it as inspired, probabilities are that he also would have admitted the Solomonic authorship apparently affirmed by the book itself. In fact while many writers, influenced by his authority, thought that Solomon was not the author of Wisdom, and even that the work itself was not inspired,[4] others preferred to abide by the title and by what seemed to them to be the plain statements of the book. A middle position was afterward suggested, viz., that the book of Wisdom is Solomonic, inasmuch as it has a Solomonic basis: the main ideas and sentiments in it are Solomon's, which a Hellenistic Jew reproduced and elaborated freely at a later date.[5] At the present day almost all scholars of any note, Catholic and Protestant alike, have come openly to say that Solomon is not the author of the book of Wisdom; that "a subsequent writer assumed Solomon's name in order to secure a greater authority for his own teachings";[6] and that "the work has been ascribed to Solomon because its author, through a literary fiction,

[1] Cfr. ix. 7, 8, 12; vii. 1, 5; viii. 13, 14; etc.

[2] Among them may be mentioned Clement of Alexandria, St. Basil, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, Lactantius, etc.

[3] Cfr. St Jerome's Preface to the Solomonic writings

[4] Cfr. "General Introd to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer.

[5] Card. BELLARMINE, Bp. HUET, and others held that view of the matter.

[6] H. LESÊTRE, Manuel d'Introduct. à l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 443.

Digitized by Google

speaks as if he were the son of David."[1] "That the author assumes the name of Solomon is of course apparent. Such a use of fiction has been common in all ages without any suspicion of fraud being attached to the writer. Plato and Cicero in their Dialogues introduce real characters as vehicles for supporting or opposing their own views. . . . All the Sapiential Books, though some were confessedly of much later date, were commonly attributed to Solomon, as being himself the ideal personification of Wisdom and the author *par excellence* of works on this subject. And when the writer introduces Solomon himself speaking, this is not done with any intention of leading his readers to believe that the work was a genuine production of the son of David. Written, as we shall see, at a period many centuries removed from the palmy days of Israel, at a place distant from Jerusalem, in a language and style unfamiliar to the Hebrew king, the book could never have claimed for itself the authority of that royal name except by a fiction universally understood and allowed."[2] In a like strain, A. Condamin, S.J., argues that in both the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiastes the writers impersonate Solomon through a literary fiction, and quotes Cornely, S.J. (Introd. ii, part ii, p. 248), to the effect that "any writing treating of Wisdom may have been ascribed to Solomon as the ideal representative of Hebrew wisdom."[3] In fine, even the current editions of the Douay Version affirm in the notice prefixed to the book of Wisdom that "the book is written in the person of Solomon," and that "it is uncertain who was the writer."

Beside Solomon, the writer to whom the authorship of the book of Wisdom has been oftenest ascribed is Philo,

[1] VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, n. 868. Cfr. the well-nigh identical words of Abbé J. B. PELT, in Histoire de l'Ancien Testament, vol. ii, p. 392.

[2] W. J. DEANE, the Book of Wisdom, p. 24.

[3] CONDAMIN. Etudes sur l'Ecclesiaste, "Revue Biblique," Jan., 1900, pp. 37, 39-43.

Digitized by Google

the celebrated Jewish philosopher of Alexandria († aft. 40 A.D.). This is a very ancient view, for it is mentioned by St. Jerome[1] in these words: "Nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc (librum Sapientiæ) esse Judæi Philonis affirmant." It has since been adopted by many scholars,[2] chiefly on the ground that, in matters of doctrine, the author of Wisdom and Philo present a general agreement; but at the present day it is universally rejected. All feel that the material differences between the book of Wisdom and Philo's writings preclude a common authorship. The allegorizing method of treating the Scriptural narratives, to which the Alexandrian philosopher resorts constantly,[3] is entirely foreign to the author of Wisdom, who takes the facts of Jewish history he refers to in their obvious literal sense. "The description of the origin of idolatry in Wisdom and in Philo's works could never have been written by the same author, as there are many points discrepant and contradictory."[4] Philo's doctrine of ideas, which forms a very prominent feature in his philosophical system, would be looked for in vain in the book of Wisdom, though it might have been introduced naturally in connection with i, 3; vii, 22; viii, 19 sqq.; etc. "The diversity appears particularly in the description of divine wisdom or σοφία, compared with Philo's delineation of λόγος and σοφία. Traces of the speculative use of λόγος are wanting in our book; in Philo they are abundant. The λόγος of Philo takes the place, for the most part, of the σοφία of Wisdom. The σοφία of Philo is vague indefinite; his λόγος more

[1] Pref. to the Solomonic writings.

[2] In this connection we may mention the ingenious conjecture by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles in regard to lines 69-71 of the Muratorian Canon, where the Latin reads, "Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis scripta," and which he thinks may have been in the original Greek ὑπὸ φίλωνος, instead of ὑπὸ φίλων.

[3] In regard to Philo's fanciful allegorical methods, see "General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer, p. 418 sq.

[4] W. J. Deane, loc. cit., p. 34.

Digitized by Google

definite and intelligible. In Philo, Jewish Alexandrianism appears in a more developed state. . . . Besides, the style and manner in Wisdom are very different from those which characterize Philo. Its complexion is of an earlier and less metaphysical type."[1]

The other names that have been put forward as those of the probable authors of Wisdom must likewise be rejected. The name of Zorobabel, which has been suggested, must be set aside, for the simple reason that Zorobabel would not have written in Greek; that of Aristobulus, an Alexandrian Jew (second century B.C.), cannot be admitted, because the writer of Wisdom inveighs against kings (vi, 1; etc.), whereas Aristobulus was a courtier and a king's favorite minister; that of Apollo, also an Alexandrian Jew (cfr. Acts of the Apostles xviii, 24), is not probable either, the only basis in its favor being that Apollo was an eloquent Jew of Alexandria and might have written the work.[2]

All attempts to discover the real author of the book of Wisdom have failed. His name, like that of the writer of Ecclesiastes, is unknown. In reality its discovery would add nothing to the importance of a work the sacred character of which is put beyond question by the infallible teaching of the Church.

§ 3. *Place and Date of Composition.*

1. Place. While the name of the author of Wisdom must ever remain unknown through lack of both external and internal evidence, his locality can be easily ascertained by an unbiassed study of the style and contents of the work. The book bespeaks so good a command of the Greek language as to clearly denote an author who did not live either in Jerusalem or in Palestine any considerable time before

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 403.
[2] The point is well discussed by W. J. DEANE, loc. cit., p. 34 sq.

Digitized by Google

the Christian era. Its unequivocal use of the Septuagint, where this Version differs from the Hebrew,[1] points in the same direction; for at that time the Septuagint translation was certainly unwelcome to Palestinian Hebrews. Again, the intimate acquaintance with Greek thought and philosophical terms displayed in the book of Wisdom is superior to anything found in Jerusalem or in Palestine. "No pure Hebrew, for example, uninfluenced by the Greek philosophy, would ever have called God the 'author of beauty' (xiii, 3), or have applied to the Divine Providence the term πρόνοια (xiv, 3; xvii, 2). . . . Just as little could any such author have appropriated to his use terms, comparisons, and ideas that originated in the philosophical schools of the Greeks, and are still recognized as characteristic of them. We learn, for example, that 'the corruptible body is a load upon the soul, and the earthly tabernacle presseth down the mind' (ix, 15), which idea is purely Platonic, at least in this extreme form of it."[2] At another place (xi, 17) the expression ὕλη ἄμορφος, "the formless material" from which the world was constructed, is derived from the school of Plato. In like manner, the cardinal virtues are described as four in number (viii, 7), after the manner of Aristotle, etc. All this will appear all the more conclusive against a Palestinian origin of the book of Wisdom, because Josephus himself—that is, a Palestinian author who lived at a time when Palestinian Jews were best acquainted with Greek thought and philosophy—confesses that his countrymen had no taste for the study of foreign tongues, and were especially averse to Greek culture and education.[3] Finally, the non-Palestinian origin of the book

[1] Cfr. Wisdom ii, 10 with Isai. iii, 10; and Wisd. xv, 10 with Isai. xliv, 20 (in the LXX Isaias).

[2] E. C. Bissell, loc. cit., p. 225. Cfr. Corluy, S.J., La Sagesse dans l'Anc. Test. (vol. i of Congrès Scientif. Internat. des Catholiques, p 84).

[3] Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Book xx, chap. xi, § 2.

Digitized by Google

is confirmed by the fact that, despite its powerful arraignment of idolatry and its sublime teachings concerning the future life, Wisdom was never included within the Canon of the Jews of Palestine.

The arguments so far brought forth directly against a Palestinian Hebrew as the writer of the book of Wisdom make indirectly in favor of an Alexandrian Jew as its probable author. A Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria, the great Egyptian capital, would naturally have all the opportunities to become familiar with Greek philosophy, and acquire a good command of the Greek language; and the book once composed would soon be appreciated and counted among their sacred writings by his fellow countrymen. But besides there are direct reasons for regarding the book of Wisdom as of Egyptian origin. "Alexandria in the time of the Ptolemies was filled with Jews. It is computed that they numbered nearly one third of the whole population. Living thus in the very centre of heathen culture, they could not fail to be influenced by the spirit of the place, and to compare their own imperishable belief and their own divine revelation with the restless speculations and manifold traditions which were presented to their notice by the heathens among whom they dwelt. Here they saw that Epicurean indifference, that luxurious selfishness, that gross materialism, that virtual denial of Providence, which are so sternly and eloquently rebuked in the book of Wisdom. Here they witnessed that bestial idolatry, and that debased revolt against the pure worship of God, which meet with such severe handling in this work. A man who had these things daily before his eyes, whose righteous soul was continually vexed with this opposition to all his cherished beliefs, would naturally thus deliver his testimony, and brand the surrounding heathenism with the fire of his words. The modes of worship thus assailed, the local coloring of de-

Digitized by Google

tails, the political allusions, are distinctively Egyptian, and point conclusively to an Egyptian author. . . . They lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the writer composed his work amid the people and the scenes to which he continually refers."[1] It is because the author was writing in Egypt, and partly to show the superiority of Yahweh worship over idol worship, that he concludes his work with the time of the Exodus, when divine judgment was most severely executed on the gods of Egypt.

2. Date of Composition. Internal evidence is less conclusive with regard to the date than with regard to the place of composition of the book of Wisdom. It is indeed true that the manifest use of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch and Isaias, in Wisdom ii, 12; vi, 7; xi, 4; xii, 8; xv, 10; xvi, 22; xix, 21, bring the completion of the book later than about 200 B.C.[2] But how much later cannot be defined. It is beyond doubt, too, that since the book of Wisdom contains no trace of distinctively Christian doctrine (of the Incarnation, the Redemption, etc.), it was composed before the spread of Christianity. But how much earlier cannot be ascertained.

To reach an approximate date between these two extreme limits, the contents of the book have been closely examined, and the results thereby obtained are briefly as follows. When compared with the contents of Philo's

[1] W. J. DEANE, the Book of Wisdom, p. 30 sq. See also C. H. H. WRIGHT (the Book of Qoheleth, chap. iii), who thinks that the book of Wisdom was distinctly written against Jewish free-thinkers of Alexandria who defended their obnoxious tenets by arguments derived from the book of Qoheleth itself, boldly propounding materialistic theories, denying a future state of existence, etc., on the plea that Solomon, the very impersonation of wisdom, was on their side. In this way would Dr. Wright account for the striking verbal similarities which exist between the expressions of the adversaries of morality and religion as set forth in the book of Wisdom and those which actually occur in Ecclesiastes.

[2] In regard to the manner in which the LXX Version, begun with the translation of the Law, about 280 B.C., was gradually concluded, see "General Introd. to the Study of the Scriptures," by the present writer, p. 23 sqq.

Digitized by Google

writings, those of the book of Wisdom clearly point to a date anterior to Philo († ab. 40 A.D.). "While agreeing in some particulars with Philo's philosophical views, Wisdom differs from them most essentially, though, generally speaking, standing in relation to them of a system imperfect and crude to one fully developed and complete."[1] In like manner the literal method of understanding Holy Writ so constantly applied in the book of Wisdom represents a stage in interpretation anterior to the allegorical method of the Alexandrian philosopher. Even in point of style the Greek of Wisdom appears more sober, especially as regards the heaping up of adjectives,[2]—and consequently requires an earlier date,—than that of Philo Judæus.

Viewed from another standpoint, the contents of the book of Wisdom allow us to fix the probable date of its composition in a more definite way. They describe a period of moral degradation and bloody persecution under unrighteous rulers who are threatened with heavy judgment. Now the only persecutions suffered by the Jews under the Ptolemies took place in the reigns of Ptolemy IV., Philopator (B.C. 222–204), and Ptolemy VII., Physcon (B.C. 145–117), so that the depraved and sanguinary rule of one or the other of these monarchs[3] must be considered as the time which the sacred writer has in view. "It is highly probable that the book of Wisdom was published after the demise of those princes, for otherwise it would have but increased their tyrannical rage."[4]

[1] E. C. Bissell, loc. cit., p. 226.

[2] In one instance Philo applies no less than one hundred and fifty different epithets to a person in order to characterize his licentiousness.

[3] Welte, Hanneberg, Cornely, Pelt, Deane, etc., think that the book of Wisdom refers to the former prince; Grimm, Samuel Davidson, Vigouroux, etc., that it refers to the latter.

[4] H. Lesêtre, Manuel d'Introduction, vol. ii, p. 445.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER VIII.

ECCLESIASTICUS, OR THE WISDOM OF JESUS, SON OF SIRACH.

I. PRINCIPAL NAMES AND CONTENTS:

- 1. Names in
  - Greek MSS. and Fathers.
  - Latin Documents.
- 2. Contents:
  - The Prologue by the Translator.
  - Part I. A Commendation of Wisdom, and Miscellaneous Precepts (i–xlii, 14).
  - Part II. Praises of God's works and of the renowned Forefathers of the Jews (xlii, 15–l, 26).
  - Twofold Conclusion (l, 27–29; li).

II. ORIGINAL TEXT AND ANCIENT VERSIONS:

- 1. Original Text:
  - Written in Hebrew.
  - Fragments recently discovered, amounting to one half of the book.
  - Leading Literary Features.
- 2. Ancient Versions:
  - The Septuagint: Principal MSS. and Characteristics.
  - The Old Latin: Relation to the Greek Version from which it was made.
  - The Syriac Peshitto: Made directly from the Hebrew—Its Critical Value.

III. AUTHORSHIP AND MODE OF COMPOSITION:

- 1. Authorship:
  - The Author, not Solomon, but Jesus, Ben Sirach.
  - The Author, a contemporary of Simon II. († 198 B.C.).
- 2. Mode of Composition:
  - 1st Opinion: Ecclesiasticus a Literary Unit.
  - 2d Opinion: The Work a Compilation.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VIII.

ECCLESIASTICUS, OR THE WISDOM OF JESUS, SON OF SIRACH.

§ 1. *Principal Names and Contents.*

1. Names. The title of this deutero-canonical book as usually found in Greek MSS. and Fathers is Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ, "the Wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach,"[1] or simply Σοφία Σειράχ. In substance it seems to be derived from the statement in Ecclesiasticus l, 29: "Jesus, the Son of Sirach, of Jerusalem, hath written in this book the doctrine of wisdom and instruction";[2] while in form it reads like a direct rendering of the Hebrew heading *Hokhmath Y^e^shua^c^ ben Sira'*. It seems, however, from the words of St. Jerome in his Prologue to the Solomonic writings,[3] that the Hebrew title was not *Hokhmath* (Wisdom) but *Mishle* (Proverbs) of Y^e^shua^c^ ben Sira'.[4] Perhaps in the original Hebrew Ecclesiasticus bore two titles, "Hokhmath" and "Mishle" of Jesus, son of Sirach. The other Greek names given to Ecclesiasticus are simply Σοφία, or ἡ πανάρετος σοφία, and even πανάρετος and παιδαγωγός alone.[5]

[1] This full title is found in the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and Ephræmi MSS., in St. Epiphanius, etc.

[2] In the Greek the verb is in the first person: "I, Jesus, son of Sirach, have written."

[3] Cfr. MIGNE, Patrol. Lat., vol. xxviii, col. 1242.

[4] The Tanchuma commentary to the Mishna calls the book "Mishle"; while rabbinic writers usually speak of it as *Ben Sira'*.

[5] Cfr. H. B. SWETE, An Introduction to the Old Test. in Greek, p. 201 sqq.

Digitized by Google

In the Latin Church, besides the titles more or less directly derived from the Greek, such as "Sapientia Sirach" (Rufinus); "Jesu, filii Sirach" (Junilius); "Sapientia Jesu" (Codex Claromontanus); "Liber Sapientiæ, filii Siracis" (Cassiodorus), etc.,[1] the book is commonly designated under the name of "Ecclesiasticus." This last title, somewhat similar to that of Ecclesiastes, points out the object for which this didactic work was primitively used in the Church. As a very valuable collection of moral teachings, it was considered as especially fitted for general reading and instruction. Hence it preserved the name of *Ecclesiasticus*, that is "a Church reading-book," after the other deutero-canonical writings—which are also called *Ecclesiastical*, by Rufinus[2]—ceased to be regarded as Church reading-books in any more special manner than the proto-canonical writings.[3]

2. Contents. Of the various names which have been mentioned, the one which points out best the general character of the contents of Ecclesiasticus is unquestionably that of "Wisdom." This was distinctly realized by the Greek translator of the book, who, in the Preface (or Prologue) to his work, tells us, among other things,[4] that he undertook his hard task of rendering the Hebrew Text into Greek with a view to place thereby its most wise teachings within the reach of any one desirous to avail himself of them.

[1] Cfr. the title in the official Latin Vulgate, "In Ecclesiasticum Jesu, filii Sirach. Prologus," and the liturgical quotations from Ecclesiasticus in the Roman Missal, under the title: "Liber Sapientiæ."

[2] Cfr. "General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer, p. 55.

[3] Cfr. Abbé H. Lesêtre, l'Ecclésiastique (Lethielleux' Bible), p. 1.

[4] This Prologue, the genuineness of which is undoubted, contains valuable statements concerning the date and place of the Greek translation, the name and ability of the author of the book, etc. These and other such pieces of information as are afforded by the Prologue will be utilized in the course of the discussion concerning the date, authorship, etc., of Ecclesiasticus.

Digitized by Google

The contents themselves of the book are also best grouped under the general heading of "Wisdom." Although the materials utilized by the writer of Ecclesiasticus appear, at times, of a miscellaneous character, yet the two great parts (i–xlii, 14; xlii, 15–l, 26) into which the contents may be divided have clearly for their object to emphasize the theoretical and practical excellence of Hebrew Wisdom. The first part is in fact made up chiefly of miscellaneous precepts, analogous in many respects to the contents of the book of Proverbs, and all tending to inculcate the fear of God and the fulfilment of His commands, wherein consists true wisdom.[1] Furthermore, its opening chapter is devoted to a long description of the origin and superior excellence of wisdom; and similar praises of wisdom are embodied at different places of the first part (cfr. iv, 12–22; vi, 18–37; xiv, 22–xv, 11; xxiv). The contents of the second part of the book centre also in the praise of wisdom. They contribute very materially to the setting forth of that general topic, by describing at length the divine wisdom so wonderfully displayed in the realm of nature (xlii, 15–xliii), and illustrating the practice of wisdom in the various walks of life, as made known by the history of the illustrious men of Israel, from Enoch down to the high priest Simon, the holy contemporary of the writer (xliv–l, 26).

The first conclusion of the book (l, 27–29) contains, together with the author's signature, an express declaration of his general purpose "to write in the book the doctrine of wisdom and instruction" and thereby bring it to the practical knowledge of his fellow men. The second conclusion —a real appendix[2]—is a rendering of thanks to God for His benefits, and particularly for the gift of Wisdom (li).

[1] Some writers, among whom may be mentioned CORNELIUS À LAPIDE, S.J. went even so far as to think that the author followed the order of the Decalogue in the delivery of his moral precepts.

[2] Cfr. FILLION's edition of the Latin Vulgate

Digitized by Google

Such are the best-ascertained divisions of the book of Ecclesiasticus. Many attempts have indeed been made to include even its minute details within a systematic scheme of its contents. But all such attempts have proved unsatisfactory, especially in regard to the first part (i–xlii, 14), in which maxims relating to the conduct of life are not arranged in anything like a logical and continuous order.[1]

§ 2. *Original Text and Ancient Versions.*

1. Original Text. Until quite recently the book of Ecclesiasticus was known to modern scholars only by means of translations and scanty citations in Talmudic and Rabbinical writers. According to the Translator's Prologue, it was originally written in "Hebrew" ἑβραϊστί, a term which might mean either Hebrew proper or Aramaic. In like manner St. Jerome in his Preface to the Solomonic writings affirms that he saw the Hebrew original, but it might still be doubted whether it was truly a Hebrew Text or not rather a Syriac or Aramaic translation *in Hebrew letters*. Again, "on this point the citations of Rabbinical writers—sometimes without acknowledgment, sometimes under the name of Ben Sira', sometimes in Hebrew, sometimes in Aramaic or debased form—were not decisive, since it was not certain that they came from a Hebrew original; and even the quotations of Saadia (tenth century), which are in classical Hebrew, were similarly open to suspicion. After this the traces of a Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus become indistinct. . . . Still, that its language was Hebrew, not Aramaic, had been inferred by critics from certain obvious errors in the Greek Version—for example, xxiv, 37 (in Greek, verse 27), 'light' for 'Nile' (יאר); xxv, 22

[1] Cfr. Samuel DAVIDSON. Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p 411 sq.; Abbé J. TOUZARD, art. Ecclésiastique (le Livre de l'), in VIGOUROUX, Dict de la Bible, col. 1550 sq. etc.

Digitized by Google

(Greek, verse 15), 'head' for 'poison' (רש); xlvi, 21 (Greek, verse 18), 'Tyrians' for 'enemies' (צרים). It was thought probable, also, that, since the Palestinian vernacular of the time was Aramaic, and Hebrew was a learned language, the author's vocabulary, whilst based on the Hebrew Sacred Writings (with which he was familiar), would contain late-Hebrew and Aramaic words and expressions."[1]

It is only since 1896 that documentary evidence has been forthcoming to the effect that Ecclesiasticus was originally written in Hebrew. The first Hebrew fragments of the book (xxxix, 15–xl, 6) were brought from the East by Mrs. Lewis, and identified by S. Schechter, reader in Rabbinic at the University of Cambridge (England). About the same time, in a box of literary remains acquired from the Cairo *genizzah*[2] for the Bodleian library (Oxford), no less than nine leaves apparently of the same MS.,[3] and containing xl, 9–xlix, 11, were found by A. E. Cowley and Ad. Neubauer. Soon followed the identification by Prof. Schechter of eleven leaves, containing iii, 6[e]–vii, 31[a]; xi, 36[d]–xvi, 26, of a different MS.,[4] and xxx, 11–xxxi, 11; xxxii, 1[b]–xxxiii, 3; xxxv, 11–xxxvi, 21; xxxvii, 30–xxxviii, 28[b]; xlix, 14[c]–li, 38, of the first Codex. These very important fragments had been secured from the same Cairo *genizzah* for the University of Cambridge; and it is among literary matter obtained from that same source by the British Museum that G. Margoliouth discovered (in 1899) two leaves of apparently the first MS. (B), and presenting xxxi, 12–xxxii, 1[a]; xxxvi, 21–xxxvii, 29. Thus by the end of

[1] C. H. Toy, art. Ecclesiasticus, in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 1166. See also E. C. Bissell, Ecclesiasticus, in the Apocrypha (addit. vol. to the Lange-Schaff Comm.), p. 276 sq.

[2] The *Genizzah* was a special chamber usually attached to Jewish synagogues, and to which were consigned defective MSS.

[3] This MS. is known as MS. "B."

[4] It is called MS. "A."

Digitized by Google

1899 the greater part of chaps. iii–vii; xii–xvi; xxx–xxxii; xxxv–li, or about 435 verses, in the original Hebrew, had been identified by scholars.

The Hebrew fragments of Ben Sira' discovered in 1900 and coming also from Cairo are of especial importance, inasmuch as they belong to two MSS. distinct from those already known (A, B), and called on that account C and D respectively. The passages in Codex C (xxxvi, 29[a]–xxxviii, 1[a]) contain matter already found in MS. B; while those in Codex D (iv, 28[b]–v, 15[c]; vi, 18[a]–vii, 27[b]) are sections embodied in MS. A.[1] They therefore prove that the book of Ecclesiasticus was often copied in former ages, and supply a valuable means of testing the text by a comparison of the parallel passages in the MSS. thus far discovered.

Despite the attempts made chiefly by the venturesome scholar Prof. D. S. Margoliouth to disprove the originality of the text presented by these various fragments, it can be confidently affirmed that the newly-found Hebrew Text is not a re-translation of Ben Sira' from the Persian or Syriac Versions into Hebrew.[2] This genuine Hebrew Text is indeed altered in some places so as to agree with the Syriac translation of Ecclesiasticus, and teems besides with errors of transcription, which are all the more numerous because the Jewish copyists of the work did not regard it as canonical. It remains true, however, that, "if we omit Arabisms and other scribal faults, the diction of the text is that of a man who, while his vernacular is that of an incipient late-Hebrew, similar to that of Qoheleth (Ecclesiastes), is familiar with the greater part of the Hebrew Old Testa-

[1] A last leaf of MS. D was discovered by Dr. M S. Gaster. It contains xviii, 31[b]–xx, 13, with xxxvii, 22, 25, 27, 29 intercalated. It will be noticed that xxxvii, 22, 25, 27, 29 are matter already found in MSS. B and C

[2] For an able discussion of the question, see J. Touzard, les Nouveaux Fragments Hébreux de l'Ecclésiastique (Paris, 1901). Cfr. also art. Ecclesiasticus, in the Encyclopædia Biblica, vol. ii, col. 1167 sqq.

Digitized by Google

ment, and freely quotes or imitates its language. According to W. Bacher (Jewish Quarterly Review, 1897) and S. Schechter, the text exhibits post-Talmudical mosaic (*paitanic*) features, that is to say a number of ready-made expressions and phrases borrowed from the Old Testament. This, however, seems to be too strong a statement: the language of Ben Sira' rarely produces the impression of being artificial or lacking in spontaneity. Nor can it be said to contain Midrashic elements, if by 'Midrash' is meant the style of the Talmud."[1]

2. Ancient Versions. The Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus was rendered into Greek by a Palestinian Jew, the author's grandson, who came to Egypt at a certain time, and desired to make the work accessible to all lovers of Wisdom. This much we infer from the Prologue to the Greek translation which is now embodied in the Septuagint Version. The name of the translator is unknown,[2] and from his work it can only be gathered that he was a man of good general culture, with a fair command of both Hebrew and Greek. The translation itself was a faithful, usually close, rendering of the original, and would be of the greatest service toward the criticism of that Hebrew original, had it come down to us in its primitive condition. As shown by a comparison of its extant MSS., which all go back to one exemplar of the Greek text,[3] the primitive work of the translator has been tampered with in such a way that in many

[1] Prof. Toy, art. Ecclesiasticus, in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 1167. See also J. Touzard, loc. cit., p. 12 sqq. Ben Sira' was written in classical Hebrew, notwithstanding D. S. Margoliouth's rash assertion to the contrary

[2] In certain documents (the *Synopse of Sacred Scripture* ascribed to St. Athanasius; in St. Epiphanius, etc.) his name is given as Jesus, son of Sirach. The statement may be correct, but is most likely only a guess (cfr. Ecclesiasticus l. 29).

[3] This has been inferred from the fact that all our Greek MSS. have chaps xxx-xxxvi displaced from their natural order, which is made known to us by the Latin translation, and by the Syriac and Armenian Versions (cfr. H. B. Swete, the Old Test. in Greek, vol. ii, p. vi sq. Cambridge, 1891).

Digitized by Google

cases it is hardly possible to do more than to give a conjectural emendation. The great uncials,—the Vatican, the Sinaitic, the Ephræmi Codex, and partly the Alexandrian, —though comparatively free from glosses, contain an inferior text; and the better form of the text seems to be preserved in the Venetus Codex, and in certain cursive MSS., though these have many glosses. In general these glosses resemble the Greek additions in the book of Proverbs: they are expansions of the thought, or Hellenizing interpretations, or additions from current collections of gnomic sayings.[1] The principal interpolations and differences of arrangement of sections from chap. xxx and onwards are given by Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 419, and J. TOUZARD in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, art. Ecclésiastique, col. 1548.

It is from the Greek translation that the Old Latin Version—which is an anterior to St. Jerome, and unrevised by him because he declined to have anything to do with the deutero-canonical writings[2]—was made; although such scholars as Cornelius à Lapide, S.J., P. Sabatier, O.S.B., and others, struck with the important differences existing between it and the Greek, have maintained that it was a direct rendering from the original Hebrew. This Latin Version had retained many Greek words in a Latinized form (as 'lingua *eucharis*,' vi, 5; in *eremo*, xiii, 23; homo *acharis*, xx, 21; etc.), and exhibits many Latin words which have been formed with reference to the Greek reading (as *obductio* for ἐπαγωγή, ii, 2; v, 10; *apostatare* faciunt for ἀποστήσουσι, xix, 2; etc.); so that the text rendered by the Latin translator was unquestionably Greek, not Hebrew. Together with these Grecized forms, the Old Latin Version of Ecclesiasticus presents many barbarisms and solecisms (such

[1] Prof. Toy, loc. cit., col. 1170.
[2] Pref. to the Solomonic Writings (MIGNE, Patr. Lat., vol. xxviii, col. 1242 sq.).

Digitized by Google

as *defunctio*, i, 13; *religiositas*, i, 17, 18, 26; *compartior*, i, 24; *inhonoratio*, i, 38; *receptibilis*, ii, 5; *peries*, *periet*, viii, 18; xxiii, 7; etc.), which betray a translator who had but a poor command of the Latin language.[1] When compared with the Greek text it is found indeed to contain chaps. xxx–xxxvi in their proper place, and therefore to represent "a Greek text earlier in this particular than that which is known to us through our existing MSS.,"[2] but also to abound in additions foreign to the Greek, such, for instance, as i, 17–19, 26, 35^{b}; ii, 2^{b}, 3^{a}, 6^{c}, 10, 16^{b}, 21; iii, 1, 4^{b}, 10^{b}, 16, 24^{b}, 28, 32; iv, 21, 27; ix, 10, 11; x, 11, 21; xiii, 9, 11; xiv, 21, etc. These additional lines or verses, which oftentimes interfere with the poetical parallelism of the book, are either repetitions of preceding statements under a slightly modified form, or glosses inserted by the translator or the copyists. As the translator was generally faithful in rendering the Greek before him, his work would be of the greatest use to determine the Greek readings in the first or second century of our era, had it been more accurately transcribed by copyists in the course of ages.[3]

The same thing cannot be said in connection with the Syriac Version of Ecclesiasticus. When compared with the newly-discovered Hebrew fragments of the book it is clear that it was made directly from the Hebrew;[4] but the text it renders was very defective, as proved by the numerous lacunæ noticeable in the Syriac Version; and further the text seems to have been rendered by the translator himself in a careless and even, at times, in an arbitrary manner. So that even from the beginning this translation did not possess

[1] Cfr. Cornelius à Lapide, S.J., In. Eccli. Prol., chap. vi; H. Lesêtre, l'Ecclésiastique in Lethielleux' Bible, p. 12.

[2] H. B. Swete, loc. cit., p vii

[3] Cfr. J. Touzard, loc. cit, col. 1549; H. Lesêtre, loc. cit., p. 12.

[4] Some scholars among whom are reckoned O. Fritzsche, Abbé Lesêtre, etc., think that it was made from the Greek

Digitized by Google

much critical value. It enjoys still less value at the present day, for it has been considerably revised by means of the Greek Version.

§ 3. *Authorship and Mode of Composition.*

1. Authorship. The author of Ecclesiasticus is not Solomon, to whom the work was often ascribed by early ecclesiastical writers. In fact, in connecting Solomon's name with that sapiential book, "the best-informed among them"[1] meant no more than to affirm that Ecclesiasticus belonged to the same gnomic kind of poetry, the ideal representative of which in Israel was King Solomon.[2] At the close of the book (l, 29) the author calls himself "Jesus, the Son of Sirach, of Jersualem"; and, agreeably to this, the translator's prologue designates him under the same name: "my grandfather, *Jesus*"; while internal evidence (for instance, xxiv, 13 sqq.) confirms his Palestinian origin. Dissatisfied with this meagre, though precise, information regarding Ben Sira', some scholars have tried to fill up the short notice in chap. l, 27. But their conjectures are either unwarranted or absolutely improbable. The data brought forth (xxxviii, 1–15; xxxi, 22 sqq.; etc.) to show that he was a physician are insufficient evidence; while the similarity of names is no excuse for confounding him, a man of manifestly pious and honorable character, with the ungodly and Hellenizing high priest Jason.[3]

The time at which Jesus, son of Sirach, lived can be given with tolerable precision. His *grandson*, who rendered

[1] Thus they are called by St. AUGUSTINE, de Civitate Dei, Book xvii, chap. xx (Patr. Lat. vol. xli, col. 554).

[2] Cfr. CORNELY, S.J., Introd. specialis, part ii, vol. ii, p. 248; TOUZARD, loc cit., col. 1544.

[3] Jason is a common Greek name frequently adopted by Hellenizing Jews as the equivalent of JESUS, JOSUE. Concerning that unworthy high priest, see "Outlines of Jewish History," by the present writer p 3: sq.

Digitized by Google

the work into Greek, says in the Prologue that he (the grandson) came into Egypt ἐντῷ ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ ἔτει επὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέος. The "thirty-eighth year" here spoken of by the translator cannot mean that of his own age, for such a specification would be totally irrelevant. It denotes the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes, for the Greek grammatical construction of this passage is usually employed in the Septuagint Version to indicate the year of the rule of a prince.[1] "Now seeing that of the two Ptolemies who were surnamed 'Euergetes,' the one reigned only twenty-five years (247–222 B.C.), it is only the second who can be intended, and whose full name was Ptolemy VII., Physcon Euergetes II. This latter prince in the first instance shared the throne along with his brother (from the year 170 onwards) and subsequently reigned alone (from the year 145 onwards). But he was in the habit of reckoning the years of his reign from the former of those dates. Consequently that thirty-eighth year in which the grandson of Jesus, the son of Sirach, came to Egypt would be the year 132 B.C. That being the case, his grandfather may be supposed to have lived and to have written his book somewhere between 190 and 170 B.C."[2]

Internal evidence confirms powerfully this inference. Ben Sira' speaks with such a glow of enthusiasm of "the high priest Simon, son of Onias," as the last in the long line of Jewish worthies, that he must himself have been a witness of the glory which he depicts (l, 1–16, 22, 23). Now of the two "Simons," both "high priests" and "sons of Onias," known in Jewish history, one held the supreme pontificate between 226 and 198 B.C., and seems

[1] Cfr. Aggeus i, 1; ii, 1, 11; Zach. i. 1, 7; vii, 1; I Mach. xiii, 42; xiv, 27; Jerem xlvi, 2; etc. See CORNELY, S.J., loc. cit, p 251 sq.

[2] Emil SCHÜRER, loc. cit., p. 26 There is no sufficient reason for taking the word πάππος otherwise than in its usual sense, "grandfather."

Digitized by Google

the only one to whom certain details of the picture drawn by the son of Sirach can truly apply.[1] Ben Sira' could therefore easily be his contemporary, and, as a pious admirer of the great Pontiff, close the record of the illustrious men of Israel with a vivid description of what Simon had done in the Holy City and its Temple.

Other arguments could be easily brought forth to show that the time at which the author of Ecclesiasticus lived was about the beginning of the second century B.C.[2] But those that have been pointed out are sufficient to justify the position assumed, and to explain how modern critics, in increasing number,[3] prefer it to the view which regards Ecclesiasticus as composed at the time of Simon I., about a century earlier (about 280 B.C.).

2. Mode of Composition. As regards the manner in which the writer of Ecclesiasticus composed his work two principal opinions are held. According to many scholars a careful examination of the topics treated and of their arrangement proves that the whole work must be ascribed to one man. Throughout the book there is but one general purpose, that of teaching the practical value of Hebrew Wisdom, and there is a manifest unity of mental attitude towards God, life, Wisdom, the Law, etc. Differences of tone exist indeed in various paragraphs relating to minor topics, but the diversities do not go beyond the bounds of a single experience. The author wrote apparently at different intervals, and pieces thus composed naturally bear the impress of a somewhat different frame of mind. Further, he may at times have collected thoughts

[1] Cfr. Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 416.

[2] They are well pointed out by Prof. TOY, art. Ecclesiasticus, in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col 1171 sq.

[3] Among them may be mentioned Dom CALMET, O.S.B., VINCENZI, KAULEN, ZSCHOKKE, DE WETTE-SCHRADER, Samuel DAVIDSON, FRITZSCHE, E. SCHÜRER, CORNELY, S.J., Abbé J. B. PELT, TOUZARD, S.S., etc.

Digitized by Google

that were already in current and popular use, or even drawn material from books or unpublished discourses of sages.[1] "But in any case he was not a mere collector or compiler, the characteristic personality of the author stands out far too distinctly and prominently for that. Notwithstanding the diversified character of the apothegms, they are all the outcome of one connected view of life and the world."[2]

The second opinion regarding the manner in which the book of Ecelesiasticus was composed maintains that the work is a compilation. "The book itself appears to recognize the incorporation of earlier collections into its text. Jesus, the son of Sirach, while he claims for himself the writing of the book (ἐχάραξα), characterizes his father as one 'who poured forth a shower of wisdom (ἀνώμβρησε σοφίαν) from his heart';[3] and the title of the book in the Vatican MS. and in many others may be more than a familiar abbreviation (σοφία Σιράχ). From the very nature of his work, the author was like 'a gleaner after the grape-gatherers,'"[4] that is a collector or compiler. In fact the structure of the work still betrays a compilatory process. That chap. li was appended to the book after its completion is suggested by the colophon in l, 29 sqq. At the beginning of the book, chap. i reads like a general introduction to the book, and indeed as one different in tone from the chapters by which it is immediately followed. In the body of the work, chap. xxxvi, 1–19 is a prayer for Israel, altogether unconnected with the maxims in verses 20 sqq. of the same chapter; chap. xlii, 15–l, 26 is a discourse clearly separate from the prudential sayings by which it is immediately preceded; chaps. xvi, 24; xxiv, 1; xxix, 16,

[1] Cfr. H Lesêtre, Manuel d'Introduction à l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 452; Tov, loc. cit., col. 1173.

[2] Emil Schürer, loc. cit., p. 25.

[3] Ecclesiasticus l, 29 (Greek, verse 27). Cfr. also viii. 9; xxxiii, 16 sqq.

[4] Westcott, art. Ecclesiasticus, in Smith, Bib. Dict., vol. i, p 651 (Amer Edit.).

Digitized by Google

are new starting-points which, no less than the passages opening with the address "my son" (ii, 1; iii, 19; iv, 1; vi, 18; etc.), and the addition in l, 27, 28, make against the unity of composition. Other traces of a compilatory process consist in the repetition of several sayings in different places of the book (cfr. xx, 32, 33; xli, 17[b], 18; etc.), and in apparent discrepancies of thought and doctrine, etc.,[1] all of which are best accounted for by the use of several smaller collections containing each the same saying, or differing considerably in their general character. Finally, when one bears in mind, on the one hand, that Ecclesiasticus was composed as a complement to the book of Proverbs, which it closely resembles in point of contents, poetical form, idiom used, and even of title (*Proverbs*, according to St. Jerome),[2] and that, on the other hand, the literary features that have just been pointed out to establish the compilatory character of Ecclesiasticus are practically identical with those which are usually brought forth to prove that the book of Proverbs is a compilation, he can hardly fail to regard as very probable that Ecclesiasticus, like Proverbs, is the work of a compiler.

[1] Cfr. the differences of tone in chaps. xxv; xvi; xxxix, 21–41; xl, 1–11; etc.

[2] If, as affirmed by BICKELL, and as apparently confirmed by the newly-found Hebrew fragments of Ecclesiasticus, chap. li of the book is an alphabetical poem, this chapter forms a striking counterpart to the Praise of a Virtuous Woman, also an alphabetical poem, which is appended to the book of Proverbs.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

DIVISION II.

THE PROPHETICAL WRITINGS.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER IX.

Preliminary Remarks on the Prophetical Writings.

I. Nature of the Prophetical Office:

1. Meaning of the Words: Prophet; Prophecy.
2. Prophetical Mission: Its Proper Object, essentially Religious.
3. Prophetical Inspiration:
   - Described in its Main Features.
   - Contrasted with Heathen Divination.

II. General Features of the Prophetical Books:

1. Oratorical and Poetical Features.
2. A Summary of the Mission and Discourses of the Prophet.
3. Obscurity of the Prophetical Writings.
4. Unity and Sublimity of Doctrine.

III. Arrangement of the Prophetical Writings.

- In the Hebrew Bible:
  - The Earlier Prophets (Reason of this Designation).
  - The Later Prophets:
    - The Three Great Prophets.
    - The Twelve Minor Prophets.
    - (Daniel among the "Writings.")
- In the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and Christian Versions generally.
- According to principal Epochs in Hebrew Prophecy:
  - The Prophets of the Eighth Century (760–700 B.C.).
  - The Half Century before the Exile (640–600 B.C.).
  - The Babylonian Captivity (592–538 B.C.).
  - The Post Exilic Prophets.

Digitized by Google

DIVISION II.

THE PROPHETICAL WRITINGS.

CHAPTER IX.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON THE PROPHETICAL WRITINGS.

§ 1. *Nature of the Prophetical Office.*[1]

1. Meaning of the Words Prophet, Prophecy. It is impossible to peruse the historical records of the Old Testament without noticing that, chiefly during the Royal Period, there existed in the Jewish State a powerful element for the guidance of both rulers and people in the person of the prophets of Yahweh and in their prophecies or prophetical utterances. The *Seer* or *Prophet*[2] of that period —as indeed of any period in Jewish history—was neither necessarily nor exclusively a man endowed with supernatural insight into the future, and hence able to foretell far-distant events, although, to be considered as a *true* prophet, predictions, if made by him, had to be verified by the event. He

[1] Most of the topics concerning the prophetical office and usually treated as a preface to the prophetical writings have been dealt with in chaps. xxiii, xxiv of "Outlines of Jewish History," by the present writer. They are therefore omitted here, except the general remarks regarding the "Nature of the Prophetical Office," which are borrowed from chap xxiii of the "Outlines."

[2] According to I Sam. ix, 9, the title "Seer" (*Ro'eh*) was more ancient than that of "Prophet" (*Nabhi'*).

Digitized by Google

was rather, according to the constant meaning of the Hebrew word rendered by "prophet,"[1] the man who had been selected by Yahweh to receive and communicate to others knowledge of the Divine will and purposes. The prophet was thus the mouthpiece of the God of Israel, and his prophecy a Divine message.[2]

2. Prophetical Mission. No one, of course, could lawfully call himself a prophet of Yahweh, and claim to give utterance to a Divine message, who had not been selected and called by the Almighty for the exalted mission of being His messenger and speaking in His name. This prophetical mission, when actually intrusted to a man, was ever in harmony with the essentially theocratic character of the Jewish people, and its proper object was not so much the political or material well-being of the nation as its moral and religious advantage. The true prophet had stood in the counsel of Yahweh, the God and King of Israel, and when he came forth he spoke the words he had heard from His mouth.[3] His mission was to declare God's will,[4] to announce God's judgments,[5] to defend truth and righteousness and innocence,[6] to keep alive the constant intercourse between God and His chosen people,[7] to make Israel's worship a moral and spiritual religion,[8] to strenuously oppose idolatry and earnestly promote compliance with the Divine law, and ultimately to prepare by all this the nation

[1] Cfr. Exod. vii, 1; Jerem. i, 9; etc. See B. DAVIDSON, A Concordance of the Hebrew and Chaldee Scriptures.

[2] Cfr. J. B. PELT, Histoire de l'Ancien Test., vol. ii, p. 136; Chas. ELLIOTT, Old Testament Prophecy, p. 21 sq.

[3] Cfr. Jerem. xxiii, 21, 22.

[4] Cfr. I Kings (Samuel) ii, 27; etc.

[5] Cfr. I Kings iii, 11 sqq.; vii; etc.

[6] Cfr. II Kings xii; III Kings xxi, 17 sqq.

[7] Cfr. I Kings vii, 3, 8; III Kings xviii; etc.

[8] Cfr. Isai. i, etc.

Digitized by Google

at large for the coming of the Messias, who was "the end of the law."[1]

3. Prophetical Inspiration. To fulfil this most important and most difficult mission the true prophets of Israel received a wonderful gift, known under the name of *prophetical inspiration.* This inspiration did not find its origin in the unassisted intelligence of man, in his natural parts and powers however great, but was the result of a special and higher supernatural working of the Spirit of God.[2] Thus Holy Writ teaches repeatedly that the prophets received their communication by the agency of the Divine Spirit,[3] while it describes the false prophets as men who "spoke out of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of Yahweh."[4]

The ordinary mode of communication between God and His prophets was what may be called a direct manifestation of His will by *word.* It usually consisted of ideas distinctly suggested to the understanding of the prophets without any articulate sound (for cases of articulate speech see I Kings iii, 4, 10, sq.; Exod. iii, 4; etc.). God revealed also His will and purposes in *visions,* and this is the very title of the prophecies of Isaias, for instance; but the precise nature of these visions cannot well be defined. It is probable, however, that ordinary pictures familiar to the prophets were presented to their imagination without any external corresponding object, and that in some cases actual apparitions are described, as, for instance, in Daniel viii, 16 sq. Finally, God's communications were made, but more rarely, in *dreams* sent during the sleep of the prophets.

The principal difference between the two latter modes of

[1] Rom. x, 4.
[2] Cfr. Heb. i, 1, 2.
[3] Numb. xi, 17, 25; I Kings x, 6; etc.
[4] Jerem. xxiii, 16.

Digitized by Google

Divine revelation and the former seems to consist in this When God spoke to the prophets, they retained the use of their external senses and the normal exercise of their intelligence and freedom. When, on the contrary, Divine communications were imparted in visions or dreams, the prophets were in what has been called *ecstasy*. Their external senses were at rest; their soul was inactive, passive, powerless to react against what they perceived, while, on the contrary, their power of intuition was raised to its highest degree and enabled the prophets to understand and behold everything with the greatest distinctness.[1]

This state of ecstasy stands in very great contrast with *heathen divination*. While the highest faculties of the Jewish prophet are the medium of communication with Yahweh, the spiritual God of Israel, the lower powers of human nature in the pagan diviner were ever conceived as the means whereby he had access to his god.[2] Again, while diviners uttered their oracles when in paroxysms of delirium and frenzy, the prophets of the Old Testament, when making their announcements, were always in full possession of themselves, knowing that they had a Divine commission, and prefacing their prophetical utterances accordingly.[3]

§ 2. *General Features of the Prophetical Books.*

1. Oratorical and Poetical Features. As might naturally be expected from men fully conscious of bearing a divine message, and bent on having it accepted by those for whom it was intended, the prophets of Israel set forth eloquently the message from Yahweh to His people, com-

[1] Cfr. Daniel viii, 18 sq.; x, 9 sq. See also VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 897 sq.; PELT, loc. cit., p. 140 sq.

[2] Cfr. W. R. SMITH, the Old Test. in the Jewish Church, second edit., p. 285 sq. See also art. Divination, in HASTINGS, Bible Dict.; and CHEYNE, Encycl. Biblica; BRUCE, Apologetics. p. 243 sqq.

[3] Cfr. HANNEBERG, Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 294 sq.

Digitized by Google

menting on it and applying it to the actual circumstances of their contemporaries. Popular orators, they resorted to every means to bring home to all the necessity of obeying the divine commands. They used for this purpose all manner of comparisons and illustrations; tender appeals and severe rebukes; descriptions of future blessings, and denunciations of awful curses, etc. Their language was direct, concrete, sometimes pathetic, always earnest and forcible. They addressed the lowly and the poor, as also the rulers and the rich, and spoke with freedom and authority, as befitted direct representatives of the invisible King of Israel. Far from seeking filthy lucre, or pursuing some paltry personal interest, they had but one object in view, that of securing a perfect acceptance of Yahweh's message, and every word of theirs tended manifestly to that one great and noble end. All this, and more, is reflected in their written words, and makes of the prophetical books a series of wonderful productions of oratory.

Side by side, or rather mingled with these oratorical features, the prophetical writings exhibit usually the leading characteristic of Hebrew poetry, the "parallelism of members." This they employ not only when "oracles" (for the expression of which the poetical form could be naturally expected) are set forth, but also when less exalted portions of the prophetical message are recorded.[1] To this is added, at times, the strophical arrangement of the parallel lines, as has been conclusively shown by recent scholars.[2] But even when these distinctively poetical features are not found in the poetical books, the poetical diction prevails in those sacred writings in regard to thoughts, images, expressions, and general style.

[1] Cfr. Bp. Rob Lowth, Isaiah; J. Touzard, S.S., les Prophètes d'Israel; etc.

[2] Cfr. especially A. Condamin, S.J., in "Revue Biblique" for April 1900 and July 1901.

Digitized by Google

2. A Summary of the Mission and Discourses of the Prophet. The oratorical and poetical features thus far pointed out are in harmony with the manner in which the prophetical writings originated. Usually the divine message was first conveyed orally to the people, or to the princes, as the case might be, and only later consigned to writing. Much, therefore, of the directness of expression, vividness of description, tone of authority, together with the various comparisons, illustrations, threats, promises, etc., which had been prominent in the spoken word naturally found place in its written record. But no less naturally the extemporaneous digressions and amplifications allowed, yea, more, expected, in an oral address to give it both spontaneity and actuality, were usually dropped, in whole or in part, from the written account of the prophet's utterances. Like the gestures or symbolical actions of the divine messenger, these were but transient features, and consequently were left unrecorded. In their stead, other features more in harmony with a written composition were substituted. Then it was that the prophetical discourse was arranged into strophes; that the rhythmical sentences were often transformed into strictly parallel lines; that something about the circumstances of the time and place and hearers of the prophecy was introduced, together with various details concerning the mission and person of the prophet himself. In this way, among others, the written prophecy assumed poetical and historical aspects more or less foreign to the primitive oral form. In this way, too, the prophetical books came to be, what they generally are, a summary, sometimes extremely brief, of the mission and discourses of the prophet.[1]

[1] This is manifestly the case with the minor prophets, whose writings cannot be thought to contain entire their prophetical utterances. The differences between the two rolls of Jeremias, which are alluded to in Jerem. xxxvi, prove that this is also the case with the writings of at least one of the greater prophets. (Cfr. Abbé TROCHON, Introd. Générale aux Prophètes, in LETHIELLEUX' Bible, p. xlv sq.)

Digitized by Google

3. Obscurity of the Prophetical Writings. The foregoing remarks concerning the form and contents of the prophetical books enable us to realize something of the difficulty one naturally meets in the interpretation of those inspired writings. They are faithful echoes of the prophet's living and powerful appeals to his contemporaries, and as such contain numerous references to places, customs and manners, views and aspirations, fears, interests, passing events, and other circumstances, which are simply alluded to in the sacred text, because thoroughly familiar to all in the time of speaking or writing, but which can be realized by the modern exegete only in so far as by close and prolonged study of history and archæology he is able to go back in thought to those remote times, and listen to Yahweh's message with practically the same frame of mind as the prophet's primitive hearers or early readers. Besides, were the prophetical writings either simply prose discourses —like those in Deuteronomy—or purely poetical compositions, they would be less difficult to understand than they actually are. Hebrew prose is generally easy reading, and poetry proper offers special helps to its right interpretation by the metrical laws to which it is subjected. But the writings of the prophets are oratorico-poetical compositions, which consequently combine the usual difficulties of poetical diction with an imperfect carrying out of the laws of Oriental poetry. The obscurity of the sacred text is also increased in many places by the difficulty of ascertaining the primitive reading.

But perhaps the main cause of the obscurity of the prophetical books consists in the fact that they are substantially made up of oracles. A certain difficulty to understand oracular utterances has always been one of their natural accompaniments, for their origin lies in the great mysterious sphere of the supernatural, and their ordinary object is

Digitized by Google

something in the hardly less mysterious and less extensive region of the future. True insight into the distant future, no less than deep insight into the distant past, implies a certain dimness of vision, and consequently also some obscurity in the expressions which are used to describe the event or personage contemplated. It is certain, moreover, in connection with the Hebrew prophets, that their manner of conceiving and describing the objects or images presented to their mental vision was not altogether independent of the limitations of their own frame of mind, as also of the conceptions of their time. This providential adaptation of revealed truth to the more or less imperfect conceptions of the prophet and his contemporaries was no doubt necessary at the time of its communication, but for us it often adds to the difficulty of realizing the distinct import of the prophetical utterances. This is particularly true in connection with the Messianic and eschatological predictions which are met with in the writings of the prophets, but is also applicable to many other of their oracles. So that, unless one is particularly careful to seek in the prophetical teachings and predictions only what they really contain, he will be tempted to read into their text ideas and doctrines which belong to a much later stage in religious development, and thereby be drawn into exegetical difficulties which no amount of subtle interpretation can bridge over.[1]

4. Unity and Sublimity of Doctrine in the Prophetical Books. Despite the many obscurities connected with the prophetical books in general, and amidst the dif-

[1] The tendency on the part of Christian commentators has been to read into the prophetical writings (as into the Old Testament generally) doctrines which they do not contain unless by very remote and unintended implication. That the religion of the prophets, though more spiritual than that of the majority of their contemporaries, had nevertheless grave limitations from the Christian standpoint is plain, for instance, from the fact that nowhere in all their exhortations to righteousness does the idea of reward or punishment in the next life appear as a sanction—a clear proof that they shared the very imperfect eschatological ideas current among the Jews until a very late period in their history.

Digitized by Google

ferences of style and contents which characterize each individual prophet, a substantial unity and wonderful sublimity of doctrine may be easily recognized in those sacred writings. The fundamental belief common to all the prophets is the existence of one only God. They all speak of Yahweh, the God of Israel, as holy and just, and watching over His people's material and moral welfare. Israel must therefore worship Him alone, trust in His powerful arm, and be in all things worthy of Him. What the Holy One of Israel requires of His worshippers does not consist in mere ritual observances or costly offerings; He rather demands of them inward righteousness and the practice of deeds of mercy. Because He hates iniquity and loves righteousness, He punishes sinners in order to bring them to repentance and to a holy life, while He showers His blessings upon the just. This is the great law of retribution in the light of which the Hebrew prophets interpret the whole history of the past, appreciate the conduct of their contemporaries, and contemplate the future. However great the present calamities endured by their nation, they never hesitate to ascribe such misfortunes to Israel's unfaithfulness, to foretell deliverance from them should the Jews be converted to Yahweh. In the eyes of them all, the Hebrews are a chosen race by means of which God will extend to the whole earth a true knowledge and pure worship of Himself. The realization of this divine design is indeed put back through the remissness of the Jews, but it will not be frustrated. Yahweh will use the pagan nations to punish His people and render the remnant thereof truly faithful to Him. The nations in their turn will be punished "in the day of Yahweh," subjected to the faithful remnant, and form together with it a universal Messianic kingdom, wherein peace and righteousness will reign for evermore, under the rule of Yahweh and His Anointed.

Digitized by Google

Such are the principal religious and ethical teachings, which appear more or less developed in the prophetical writings. They are the result of the same guiding Spirit "who spoke through them" and made of them powerful preachers of righteousness, preservers of monotheistic belief, and forerunners of the Messias. Compared with the religious and moral tenets in vigor among the pagan nations of antiquity, they appear purer and nobler and in every way more worthy of God's dealings with the children of men. In fact when Jesus, the Incarnate Word, will begin His teaching in that land which had witnessed the labors of the prophets of old, He will take up again those prophetical conceptions that had been strangely disfigured by the Scribes and Pharisees, and point out in His person and work that fulfilment which the aspirations and predictions of the divine messengers had long awaited.

§ 3. *Arrangement of the Prophetical Writings.*

1. In the Hebrew Bible. The books whose general features have just been given are but one part of the second great section, which bears the name of "the Prophets" (N^{e}bhi'im) in the Hebrew Bible.[1] The first part of that great section is called by the Jews the *earlier* prophets, and comprises books which we consider as *historical*, viz., Josue; Judges; I, II Samuel (Vulg., I, II Kings); I, II Kings (Vulg., III, IV Kings). "The fact that these historical writings are classed as *prophets* is a proof that the books of Josue, Judges, Samuel, and Kings are not mere annals or chronicles of Hebrew history. They contain history and something more. They *interpret* the events which they describe, and constantly draw attention to the purposes which Almighty God had in view throughout His dealings

[1] They include, however, one book more than the second part of that section, viz., Daniel.

Digitized by Google

with the chosen people. The events recorded are selected and arranged in such a way as to illustrate the leading ideas of the prophetic writers, especially, perhaps, the thought of God's faithfulness to His covenant promises in spite of the oft-repeated rebellion and apostasy of His chosen people, the certainty and severity of His judgments, and the depth and constancy of His compassion."[1]

The second portion of "the Prophets" in the Hebrew Bible is called the *later* prophets. According to the Jewish manner of reckoning, the later, like the former, prophets are counted as four books, i.e. three great prophets, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and one book of the twelve minor prophets (Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggæus, Zacharias, Malachias),[2] sometimes spoken of in Greek as *δωδεκαπρόφητον*.[3] This second portion of "the Prophets" comprises, therefore, the prophetical writings proper. It should be noticed, however, that Daniel, usually considered as one of the greater prophets, is not ranked among them in the Palestinian Canon. For some reasons, which we shall examine at some future time, it is placed among the books which go to make up "the Writings" (Kᵉthubhim) or third great section of the Hebrew Text.

2. In the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and Christian Versions Generally. As might naturally be expected, the Hebrew arrangement of the prophetical books proper is practically followed in the ancient and modern Versions of the Old Testament. The differences which exist in this respect between the Hebrew Text and its various transla-

[1] R. L. Ottley, the Hebrew Prophets, p. 1 sq.

[2] Especially in connection with the Minor Prophets, the Vulgate spelling of the names has been modified by Protestants in conformity with the original text. Thus they speak of Hosea, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, instead of Osee, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, etc.

[3] Cfr. H. B. Swete. Introd to the Old Test. in Greek, p. 204 sqq.

Digitized by Google

tions are connected exclusively with the greater prophets. While in the Hebrew Bible the greater prophets include only Isaias, Jeremias, and Ezechiel, in the Septuagint they include also Daniel, as already stated. Again, the Septuagint Version couples with Jeremias the book of Lamentations, which in the Hebrew Bible is placed among "the Writings" or Hagiographa; and the prophecy of Baruch together with the Epistle of Jeremias (Baruch vi), which do not exist in the Palestinian Canon.

The Septuagint arrangement of the prophetical writings was of course adopted by the author or authors of the Old Latin Version, who adhered closely to everything that was found in the Greek Text. It was accepted also in the Latin Vulgate, and continued to be the received order of the greater prophets in the vernacular translations that were made from that venerable Version, down to the time of the Protestant Reformation. Yea, more: even most of the Protestant translations that have claimed to go back to the Hebrew Text betray the influence of the Septuagint and Vulgate arrangement of the prophetical books. They have indeed rejected that traditional arrangement in regard to Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremias, because these writings are deutero-canonical, but have retained Daniel among the prophets,[1] and the Lamentations in immediate connection with the prophecies of Jeremias.

3. Arrangement of the Prophetical Writings according to Principal Epochs in Hebrew Prophecy. A last method of arrangement often adopted by recent scholars in connection with the Prophetical books groups both the greater and the minor prophets according to the principal epochs in Hebrew Prophecy. Viewed from this

[1] The deutero-canonical fragments of Daniel are also dropped in modern Protestant Versions, but without sufficient warrant, as has been shown in the "General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," part i, by the present writer.

Digitized by Google

standpoint, "the Hebrew prophets fall into at least four clearly-defined groups:

"760–700 B.C.—1. First there are the prophets belonging to the period which preceded the invasion of Juda by Sennacherib's army toward the close of the reign of Ezechias (702 B.C.); during the last sixty years of the eighth century appeared *Amos* and *Osee* in the northern kingdom (cir. 760–722 B.C.), and *Isaias* and *Micheas* in the kingdom of Juda (between 740–700).

"640–600 B.C.—2. During the reign of Manasses (698–644) the voice of prophecy was suppressed, though not altogether silenced. The next great group of prophets belongs to the half-century preceding the Exile. To this group belongs *Nahum*, the prophet of Ninive's decline and fall, an event which took place in 607 B.C., and which led to a collision between the two great monarchies of Babylon and Egypt, both of which aimed at acquiring the western territories of the fallen empire. *Sophonias* was probably the contemporary of *Jeremias*, whose ministry began about the year 627 B.C. To these must be added *Habacuc*, who apparently wrote during the first years of Joiachim's disastrous reign.

"592–538 B.C.—3. During the exile in Babylon appeared two prophets of great importance. *Ezechiel*, who was one of the captives carried away to Babylon by Nebuchodonosor in 597, exercised his prophetic ministry between the years 592–570 B.C., a period of incalculable importance in the spiritual history of Israel. Toward the close of the seventy years of exile, apparently at a time when Cyrus had already entered on his victorious career and was threatening Babylon, the prophet usually known as 'the Second Isaias' was raised up to be the comforter of his people. The last twenty-seven chapters of Isaias, or most of them at any rate, may be confidently assigned to the years between 546 and 538 B.C. They were most probably written in Babylonia.

Digitized by Google

"520–435 B.C.—4. Lastly, there are the post-exilic prophets, *Aggæus* and *Zacharias*, the energetic supporters of Zorobabel in the task of rebuilding the Temple. The date of their public ministry can be precisely fixed in the year 520, when the work which had been interrupted for sixteen years was recommenced. At an interval of nearly a century may have appeared *Malachias*, whose period of activity is most reasonably placed between the first and second visit of Nehemias to Jerusalem, about the year 435 B.C."[1]

The dates just assigned to several of the Prophets o. Israel should be regarded as provisional. Concerning those which may be ascribed to the rest of the smaller prophets, viz., Abdias, Joel, Jonas, and to the greater prophet Daniel, the difficulties are such that it is better to defer the attempt to give approximations till the various solutions proposed by scholars be set forth and discussed in the forthcoming chapters. In fact the probable dates which have been given will be taken into account only in the treatment of the *Minor* Prophets. In dealing with the *Greater* Prophets, the traditional order (Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel) which is embodied in the Septuagint and the Vulgate will be adhered to.

[1] R. L. OTTLEY, loc. cit., p. 13 sq.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER X.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAS.

Section I. Chapters I–XXXIX.

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS:

- 1. The Life and Times of Isaias.
- 2. The Two Parts of the Book of Isaias:
  - Main Divisions of i–xxxix.
  - General Divisions of xl–lxvi, proposed by scholars.

II. PROPHETICAL PART OF THE "FIRST ISAIAS" (I–XXXV):

- 1. Structure and Contents.
- 2. Method of Composition:
  - 1st Opinion: A Collection made by the Prophet:
    - The Opinion briefly set forth.
    - Its Principal Grounds.
  - 2d Opinion: A Later Compilation from Various Sources:
    - Precise Statement of this Opinion.
    - Arguments it appeals to.
    - How far Admissible.
- 3. Date of Chief Portions and of General Collection.

III. HISTORICAL APPENDIX TO THE "FIRST ISAIAS" (XXXVI–XXXIX):

- 1. Its Contents.
- 2. Its Dependence on the Text of the Fourth Book of Kings.
- 3. Authorship of chaps. xxxvi–xxxix.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER X.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAS.

SECTION I. CHAPTERS I–XXXIX.

§ 1. *Preliminary Remarks.*

1. The Life and Times of Isaias. The name of Isaias, by which the first of the prophetical writings proper is called, is in the title to the Hebrew Text *Y^e^sha'yah*, apparently a shortened form of the name *Y^e^sha'yahu* (Yahweh is Salvation), under which the prophet himself is always designated in the text of his book, as also in the historical writings of the Old Testament. In several places of his prophecy Isaias is spoken of as "the son of Amos,"[1] who must not be confounded—as has been done by several Fathers of the Church—with the prophet Amos.[2] On the ground that there is an affinity between the name of Isaias' father and that of King Amasias, the Jewish rabbis of old "gravely founded a positive assertion that these men were brothers, and that Isaias was therefore of the blood-royal, being first cousin to the first king mentioned in the opening of his prophecies. This tradition has had great vogue among Jews and Christians, some of whom account for the urbanity and polish of Isaias' manner as a natural effect of his nobility."[3] In reality we know nothing of Isaias' ances-

[1] Isai. i, 1; ii, 1; xx, 2; xxxvii, 2. Cfr. also IV Kings xix, 2; xx, 1

[2] The name of Isaias' father, in the Hebrew, is *'Amoç*; that of the prophet Amos, *'Amos*; but both words were transliterated in exactly the same way by the Septuagint translators. Hence the mistake of the Church Fathers not acquainted with the Hebrew language.

[3] Jos. A. ALEXANDER, the Prophecies of Isaiah, Earlier and Later, p. xviii.

Digitized by Google

try and early life. From his book we learn that he was married (his wife is called "the prophetess" in Isai. viii, 3), and that he had at least two sons, to whom he gave names symbolical of those aspects of the nation's history which he emphasized in his prophecies.

One of the most certain and significant facts about Isaias "is that he was a citizen, if not a native, of Jerusalem, and had a constant access to the court and presence of the king. Jerusalem is Isaias' immediate and ultimate regard, the centre of all his thoughts, the hinge of the history of his time, the summit of those brilliant hopes with which he fills the future. He has traced for us the main features of her position and some of the lines of her construction, many of the great figures of her streets, the fashions of her women, the arrival of embassies, the effect of rumors. He has painted her aspect in triumph, in siege, in famine, and in earthquake; war filling her valleys with chariots, and again nature rolling tides of fruitfulness up to her very gates; her moods of worship, panic, and profligacy. If he takes wider observation of mankind, Jerusalem is his watch-tower. It is for her defence he battles through fifty years of statesmanship, and all his prophecy may be said to travail in anguish for her new birth."[1]

It was in the last year of Ozias' reign (740 B.C.) that Isaias received his call to the prophetical office. Juda had been victorious and prosperous under the strong and wise administration of that monarch, and continued to be so under his son and successor, Joatham, except that toward the close of this latter reign troubles threatened the southern kingdom from an alliance of Israel and Syria.[2] These two powers had combined their forces to oppose a forthcoming invasion by Teglath-Phalasar III. who, ever since he had

[1] Prof. George Adam SMITH, art. Isaiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 486.

[2] IV Kings xv, 27.

Digitized by Google

ascended the throne of Assyria (745 B.C.), had carried on his policy of conquest, and in consequence they wished to compel Juda to re-enforce them (735 B.C.). Achaz, Joatham's son and successor, deemed it more expedient not only to resist their solicitations, as his father had done, but even to throw himself upon the support of the strong external power of Assyria. Juda was therefore invaded by the Syro-Ephraimitish forces, but Teglath-Phalasar advanced upon the northeastern provinces of Israel, and obliged the allied kings to withdraw. This was soon followed by the murder of Phacee, the king of Israel, the capture of Samaria and of Damascus; so that Achaz had no longer anything to fear from that quarter. Unfortunately, to secure Assyria's help, he had had to renounce his independence, and to own the suzerainty of that great empire. The successful campaigns of Salmanasar IV. and Sargon, Teglath-Phalasar's successors, against Israel[1] and Egypt, naturally deterred the southern kingdom from withholding the annual tribute to Assyria, despite the suggestions and advances of Egypt to the contrary; and this is why not only under Achaz († 715 B.C.),[2] but even during a part of the reign of Ezechias, his son and successor, Juda remained faithful to Assyrian allegiance. At length the party which, in Jerusalem, had long advocated a rupture with Assyria, and presented an alliance concluded upon equal terms with Egypt, as a position at once honorable and secure, carried the day. Ezechias threw off the Assyrian yoke, apparently under circumstances most favorable for vindicating the independence of the chosen people. Sargon had been assassinated (705 B.C.), and during four years Sennacherib, his successor, had been busy in the far East,

[1] It is under Sargon (in 721 B.C.) that Samaria was taken, and an end put to the kingdom of Israel.

[2] According to common reckoning, Achaz died in 726 B.C.; the more probable date, however, is 715 B.C.

Digitized by Google

crushing the rebellious king of Babylon, and pursuing other great undertakings. Hence the tribes and kingdoms of Western Asia—including Juda—thought they could safely proclaim themselves free. Sennacherib invaded Phœnicia, Philistia, and Juda with an immense army, and would have swept away Jerusalem and its inhabitants had not a heavenly visitation compelled him to withdraw his forces into his own land (701 B.C.).

Such are the leading political events[1] which occurred during the prophetical ministry of Isaias.[2] Through them all, that great prophet neglected nothing to remind princes and people of their duties towards Yahweh. The God of Israel he pictured as the moral ruler of all nations, of Israel's estate, as His own kingdom, as also of the petty powers which bordered on Palestine, and the vast empire of Assyria in the distant East. Let, therefore, Juda worship

[1] In this connection we subjoin DRIVER's Chronological Table (Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 205), which gives dates relating to both parts of the book of Isaias:

B C.
745. Teglath-Phalasar III.
740. Ozias' last year of reign. Call of Isaias.
734. Phacee deposed and slain; Osee (with Assyrian help) raised to the throne of Samaria, N. and E tribes exiled by Teglath-Phalasar.
732. Damascus taken by Teglath-Phalasar.
727. Salmanasar IV.
722 Sargon. Fall of Samaria, and end of the northern kingdom.
711. Siege and capture of Azotus by the troops of Sargon.
710. Sargon defeats Merodach Balladan, and enters Babylon.
705. Sennacherib.
703. Sennacherib defeats Merodach Baladan, and spoils his palace.
701. Campaign of Sennacherib against Phœnicia, Philistia, and Juda.
681. Sennacherib succeeded by Asarhaddan.
607. Ninive destroyed by the Medes and Babylonians.
586. Destruction of Jerusalem by Nabuchodonosor.
549-538. Period of Cyrus' successes in Western and Central Asia.
536 Cyrus captures Babylon, and releases the Jewish exiles.

[2] Isaias' ministry came to an end with the great deliverance of Israel from Sennacherib's army (cfr. ERMONI, art. Isaie, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 943). Whether the prophet lived till under Manasses (698-644 B C.) cannot be ascertained. For Jewish traditions concerning Isaias' martyrdom under Manasses, see ERMONI, loc. cit., col. 944 sq.

Digitized by Google

Him in true holiness of life, and dwell "in quiet and trust"[1] in His powerful and loving guidance, instead "of yielding to the pressure of circumstances by adopting a worldly policy and trusting in the material resources on which the empires of heathendom were accustomed to rely."[2] All forms of idolatry must be given up and sincere piety cultivated. Let justice be meted out to all, and public morals come up to the standard set by the thrice-holy God of Israel. On these and other such conditions Isaias has never done insisting, while in return he solemnly pledges God's guidance and protection.

2. The Two Parts of the Book of Isaias. The book ascribed to Isaias falls naturally into two great sections: (1) chaps. i–xxxix, sometimes called the "First Isaias," and (2) chaps. xl–lxvi, usually called the "Deutero (or Second) Isaias."[3]

The main divisions within the first part are as follows:

1. Chaps. i–xii. First Collection of Prophecies relating to Juda and Israel.
2. Chaps. xiii–xxiii. Oracles against the Foreign Nations.
3. Chaps. xxiv–xxvii. An Apocalyptic Prophecy.
4. Chaps. xxviii–xxxiii. Discourses concerning Juda's relation to Assyria.
5. Chaps. xxxiv–xxxv. Contrasted Future of Edom and Israel.
6. Chaps. xxxvi–xxxix. Historical Appendix to chaps. i–xxxv.

Within the second part a threefold division was pointed out by F. Rückert, in 1831, and has since been accepted by many scholars. The two first divisions, xl–xlviii, xlix–lvii, end with the *refrain*, "There is no peace, saith Yahweh, to the wicked"; and the third ends with an expansion of the thought "no peace" of the two previous divisions (cfr.

[1] Isai xxx. 15.

[2] OTTLEY, the Prophets of Israel. p 31.

[3] CORNELY, S J. (Introd. in Lib. Sacr., vol. ii part ii). is apparently the sole writer who considers chaps xxxviii, xxxix as a "historical introduction" to chaps. xl–lxvi.

Digitized by Google

lxvi, 24[b]). Furthermore, each of these three divisions has been subdivided into three times three discourses or sections, which, for the most part, are rightly indicated by the division of chapters.[1] Scholars who admit such symmetrical divisions are greatly at variance when they try to give the special object of each division. Thus, according to Le Hir the three divisions concern God, Jesus Christ, and the Church, respectively;[2] according to Dr. Netteler the first division is a *Babylonian* section, foretelling the release from the Babylonian Exile; the second is *Messianic*, treating of the Redemption to be wrought by the Messias; and the third has for its object *Sion* or *the Church*, describing the salutary effects of the Messianic rule:[3] according to Lesêtre—who in this follows Hahn—the special object of each section is given in the opening words[4] of the second part of the book, thus: the prophet wishes to console Jerusalem by showing, in chaps. xl–xlviii, how "her affliction is come to an end"; in chaps. xlix–lvii, how "her iniquity is forgiven"; and in chaps. lviii–lxvi, how "she is to receive from the hand of the Lord the double of what she has suffered for her sins."[5] Less symmetrical and, on that very account, more probable divisions and subdivisions of Isai. xl–lxvi have been proposed by other critics. Prof. Driver, for instance, says that "this great prophecy may be divided into three parts: (1) chaps. xl–xlviii; (2) chaps. xlix–lix; (3) chaps. lx–lxvi," "the common theme of which is Israel's restoration from exile in Babylon," "the prophet's aim in the first division being to demonstrate to the people the certainty of the coming release"; in the second division, chiefly "to exhort the

[1] These subdivisions have been embodied in FILLIOIN'S edition of the Latin Vulgate.
[2] LE HIR, les Prophètes d'Israel, p 107.
[3] NETTELER, das B. Isaias (Münster, 1876).
[4] Cfr. xl, 2.
[5] This is clearly an arbitrary meaning given to the last words of xl, 2.

Digitized by Google

people to fit themselves morally to take part in the Return, and to share the blessings which will accompany it or which it will inaugurate"; and in the third division, "to depict in still brighter hues the felicity of the ideal Sion of the future."[1] Parting still more with merely conventional divisions, such scholars as Cheyne, G. A. Smith, Duhm, Marti, Bennett, etc., have been satisfied with simply pointing out the sections of diverse style, length, origin, etc., which can be discovered in Isai. xl–lxvi, and which we shall briefly examine in our next chapter on the "Second Isaias."

§ 2. *Prophetical Part of the First Isaias* (*I–XXXV*).

1. Structure and Contents. The first main section of the book of Isaias, or the "First Isaias" as it is called, is chiefly made up of groups of prophecies (i–xxxv) which stand in striking contrast with the historical narrative appended to them (xxxvi, xxxix), and which, on that account, can be handled separately under the title of the *Prophetical* part of the "First Isaias."

The first group of prophecies in i–xxxv comprises the first twelve chapters of the book. The opening chapter may be considered as a general introduction on account of what has been called "its representative character."[2] Thus in it, as in the rest of the Isaianic prophecies, Juda is depicted as reduced to the last extremity by invasion, because of ingratitude of Yahweh (verses 2–9). Forgiveness can be secured, not by sacrifices, but by repentance and deeds of mercy (verses 10–17). The impenitent are doomed to destruction; but Sion shall be restored to its pristine purity (18 sqq.). This representative

[1] DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test.. p 230 sqq.

[2] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction. p. 175. In the same place Prof BENNETT points out the compilatory character of that first chapter.

Digitized by Google

character of chap. i is in harmony with its heading: "The vision of Isaias, the son of Amos, which he saw concerning Juda and Jerusalem, in the days of Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias, kings of Juda," wherein "the reigns enumerated exhaust the range of Isaias' career."[1] On the other hand, the mention "Juda and Jerusalem," to the exclusion of the foreign nations, as the object of the prophecies of Isaias, seems to imply "that the collection to which this title was prefixed did not include the Oracles on foreign nations, and was substantially our chaps. i–xi."[2] The second chapter carries also a title which probably covers the minor collection, chaps. ii–v.[3] The opening verses of chap. ii (verses 2–4) occur in Micheas iv, 1–3. They describe Jerusalem as "the centre of revelation for all nations in the Messianic era of universal peace,"[4] and contrast with ii, 5–iv, 1, which speaks of the severe judgment which Yahweh will soon exercise upon "every one that is proud and high-minded," especially because of the oppressions of the Jewish rulers and the wanton luxury of the daughters of Sion. The following verses, iv, 2–6, are a short section[5] which represents the restoration of the small remnant of Yahweh's people to a purified Jerusalem. The minor collection (ii–v) closes with a chapter made up of independent pieces,[6] as a kind of appendix. The next chapter (vi) narrates, in the first person, the call of Isaias to the prophetic mission. Chaps. vii–ix, 7 contain narratives and utterances[7] connected with the Syro-Ephraimitic war. Next comes a poetical oracle (ix,

[1] G. A. Smith, art. Isaiah, in Hastings, Bible Dict., vol. ii, p. 487.
[2] W. H. Bennett, loc cit.
[3] This is admitted by Jos. Knabenbauer, S.J., in Isaiam, p. 57; W. H. Bennett, loc. cit.; etc
[4] Bennett, loc. cit.
[5] Cfr. Knabenbauer, loc. cit., p 94.
[6] Cfr. Driver, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test, p. 208; G A. Smith, loc. cit.
[7] Chap. vii is in the third person, chap. viii, in the first person.

Digitized by Google

8–x, 4), on the doom of Northern Israel. It is apparently made up of five strophes,[1] characterized by the refrain :

> For all this His anger is not turned away,
> But His hand is stretched out still.

Chap. x, 5–34 is an oracle on Assyria and Juda, and chap. xi consists of two prophecies : one, of the Righteous King in whose time perfect peace will prevail (verses 1–9) ; the other, of the restoration of *all* Israel (10–16). The entire first collection (i–xii) concludes with a song of praise, clearly an appendix.

The second group of prophecies in i–xxxv comprises chaps. xiii–xxiii ; it is introduced by the heading : "The burden of Babylon, which Isaias the son of Amos saw." It is made up of a series of oracles entitled "Burden,"[2] and directed "against heathen nations, with a few against Juda, but none against Israel.[3] Chaps. xiii–xiv, 23 treat of the fall of Babylon ; xiv, 24–27 is on Assyria, and verses 28–32, against the Philistines, assigned by their title to the year of Achaz's death ; xv–xvi, on Moab ; xvii, 1–11, on the fall of Damascus and Northern Israel; verses 12–14, on the repulse of Assyria ; xviii, the same in the form of an address to Ethiopia; xix, on Egypt—(verses 16–25 appear to be separate from verses 1–15); xx, also on Egypt, with a bit of narrative that points to Sargon's march against her, about 711 B.C.; xxi, 1–10, on Babylon, 'the burden of the wilderness of the sea'; verses 11, 12, on Edom (Duma) ; verses 13–17, on Arabia ; xxii, 1–14, against Jerusalem during a siege, and verses 15–25,

[1] Chap. v, 25-30 is generally considered as a part of that poem.

[2] The Hebrew word *Massa'* means commonly a judicial sentence of God (cfr. Franz DELITZSCH, the Prophecies of Isaiah, 4th edit., vol. i, p. 293, Engl. Transl.). The word *Massa'* is omitted only in connection with the oracle against Assyria and Ethiopia (xvii, 12 sqq.).

[3] Northern Israel is mentioned only concomitantly with Damascus in xvii (cfr. the title the Burden of *Damascus*").

Digitized by Google

against Sobna, a statesman of Juda; xxiii, 1–14, on Tyre, with an appendix, verses 15–18."[1]

The third main division of the prophetical part of the "First Isaias" extends from chap. xxiv to chap. xxvii. It is an apocalyptic prophecy depicting vividly a judgment which is to embrace earth and heaven. The City of "Confusion" (*Tohu*) is singled out for special judgment, and described as actually brought to naught. Whereupon Israel is invited to sing hymns of praise to God, who has delivered His people from all hostile powers, and is told of the blessedness of which Sion will be the centre for all nations.

The fourth group of prophecies, made up of chaps. xxviii–xxxiii, differs much from the one by which it is immediately preceded. Its contents are less homogeneous, but also more directly connected with the circumstances of Isaias' time. In fact, in this twofold respect, the fourth group of prophecies resembles far less the apocalypse of Isai. xxiv–xxvii, than it does either the oracles against the foreign nations in chaps. xiii–xxiii, or the opening twelve chapters of the book. Thus chap. xxviii contains an oracle against Samaria (verses 1–6), whose fall is given as a warning against the unworthy leaders of Juda, who trust to Egyptian help to free themselves from the Assyrian yoke (verses 7–22). The chapter concludes with a parable inculcating God's purposes in His discipline of the chosen people (verses 23–29). Chap. xxix predicts the siege of Jerusalem, but also the sudden dispersion of the besieging forces (verses 1–8); reproaches Jerusalem with unbelief and spiritual stupidity (9–14); and closes with an exposure of a conspiracy of the Jewish rulers with Egypt, suddenly changing to a prediction of a glorious future. Chaps. xxx, xxxi are "a collection of prophecies on the folly and sin of alliance with Egypt, with which have been combined an apocalytic picture of the regeneration of

[1] G. A. SMITH, art. Isaiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii. p. 486.

Digitized by Google

Israel and the renewal of Nature in the Messianic era,[1] and two sections[2] on the deliverance of Israel from Assyria. Chap. xxxii is a picture of the Righteous King, the spiritual regeneration and material prosperity of the Messianic age, into which is inserted a warning to the women of Jerusalem. Chap. xxxiii is an apocalyptic Psalm, in which the Jews, in their distress, look forward to deliverance and the establishment of a Messianic king who shall reign in peace at Jerusalem."[3]

Lastly, chaps. xxxiv, xxxv, forming probably a section by themselves, tell of the doom of Edom when Yahweh shall judge all nations, and of the very different future of the Israelites returned from exile.

2. Method of Composition. From the foregoing account of the structure and contents of the prophetical part of the "First Isaias," it is easy to infer that this part of the book of Isaias is not a literary unit all the portions of which would be intimately bound up together and disposed according to one well-ordered plan. Chapters i–xxxv were not all written at practically one and the same time, but rather at different times and under diverse circumstances. As a matter of fact, this is explicitly granted by all scholars, who willingly speak of the work of Isaias as "simply a collection of prophecies put forth under various circumstances and at different times."[4] It is only when they attempt to define the precise manner in which those prophecies were brought together that scholars cease to agree. According to many of them, the present arrangement of the materials embodied in the

[1] Chap. xxx, 18–26.

[2] Chaps. xxx, 27-33; xxxi. 5–9.

[3] W. H. Bennett, a Biblical Introduction, p. 183. Cfr. Lowth, Isaiah, p. 60 sqq., in regard to the lyrical form of Isai. xxxiii.

[4] Abbé V. Ermoni, art. Isaïe (le Livre d'), in Vigouroux Dict. de la Bible, col. 946. What Father Ermoni grants there is little in harmony with "Unity of the the Book," such as he labors to prove in col. 957 sqq.

Digitized by Google

book of Isaias proceeds from that prophet himself. The writer was his own editor, sifting and selecting from the MSS. of many years, and disposing them at times in chronological order, at other times according to a method independent of that order, and determined by personal or ideal associations.[1] Of course, we are told that, in carrying on the work, Isaias may have been aided by a scribe, as we know this was the case with the prophet Jeremias.[2] The principal grounds usually set forth in favor of that view are briefly as follows: (1) As Ezechiel and Jeremias are unquestionably the authors of the contents and form of their respective prophecies, it is only natural to admit that Isaias stands in the same relation to his prophetical utterances[3] (2) "In the book (chaps. i–xxxix) we can discern traces of gradual collection, and that during Isaias' lifetime. Chap. i contains the introduction to such a first collection, which accordingly would belong to the time of Achaz, and perhaps only embraced chaps. i–vi, the narrative of the prophet's consecration being added by way of appendix. Chaps. i–xii may have been thus brought together by Isaias in the time of Ezechias, these being followed by the older oracles respecting foreign nations (see xiv, 24–27), which were then enlarged in a later collection, without losing their place after chaps. i–xii. The Ezechias discourses (apparently chap. xiv sqq.) were put next to them."[4] (3) The title of the prophecies of Isaias (i, 1) is in no way *exclusive*, and does not deny to Isaias anything of his recorded "vision under Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias." It therefore implies the Isaianic authorship both of the prophecies delivered

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, n. 912.
[2] Cfr. Jerem. xxxvi, 4 sqq
[3] See V. ERMONI, loc. cit., col. 946.
[4] C. VON ORELLI, the Prophecies of Isaiah. p. 7 (Engl Transl.). Cfr. also VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii. n. 912. footn

Digitized by Google

under those kings and of their present arrangement.[1] (4) "Isaias we know was otherwise an author; for in II Chron. xxvi, 22 we read: 'Now the rest of the acts of Ozias first and last did Isaias, the son of Amos, the prophet, write'; and though that historical work has perished, the fact remains to show that Isaias' mind was not alien to the care of written composition (comp. also II Chron. xxxii, 32; and observe the first person used in Isai. viii, 1-5)."[2]

A second opinion, in much greater vogue among contemporary critics, regards Isaias chaps. i-xxxv as the outcome of a compilatory process somewhat similar to the one now universally admitted in relation to other books—Psalms, Proverbs, for instance. Advocates of this second view readily grant that Isaias may have written his prophetical utterances, that he actually wrote some of them that are now embodied in chaps. i-xxxv, and that this incorporation of prophecies written by him in the prophetical part of the "First Isaias" is the reason for which the whole collection was ascribed to him. But they think that an unbiassed study of the structure and contents of chaps. i-xxxv proves that several of the sections, in whole or in part, should not be traced back to Isaias. They argue, for instance, that since chaps. xiii-xiv, 23 represent the Jews as in exile and captives of Babylon, but shortly to be restored[3] after the capture of Babylon by the Medes,[4] their date of composition is near the end of the Exile. "The situation presupposed by this prophecy," says Driver,[5] "is not that of Isaias' age. The Jews are not warned, as Isaias (cfr. xxxix, 6) might warn them, against the folly of concluding an alliance with Baby-

[1] Cfr. V: Ermoni, loc. cit.
[2] E. Hawkins, art. Isaiah, in Smith, Bible Dict., vol. ii, p. 1149 sq. (Amer. Edit.).
[3] Cfr. xiv. 1, 2.
[4] Isai. xiii, 17.
[5] Driver, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 212; see also Driver's Isaiah, Life and Times, p. 85 sqq.

Digitized by Google

lon, or reminded of disastrous consequences which such an alliance might entail; nor are they threatened, as Jeremias threatens them, with impending exile: they are represented as *in exile*, and as about to be delivered from it (xiv, 1–2). It was the office of the prophet of Israel to address himself to the needs of his own age, to announce to his contemporaries the judgments, or consolations, which arose out of the circumstances of their own time, to interpret for them their own history. To base a promise upon a condition of things *not yet existent*, and without any point of contact with the circumstances or situation of those to whom it is addressed, is alien to the genius of prophecy. Upon grounds of analogy, the prophecy xiii, 2–xiv, 23 can only be attributed to an author living towards the close of the exile, and holding out to his contemporaries the prospect of release from Babylon, as Isaias held out to *his* contemporaries the prospect of deliverance from Assyria. The best commentary on it is the long prophecy against Babylon contained in Jeremias l–li, 58, and written towards the closing years of the Exile, which views the approaching fall of Babylon from the same standpoint, and manifests the same spirit as this does."

For the same reason, chap. xxi, 1–10 is usually considered as exilic;[1] while various features disclosed by the study of xxiv–xxvii; xxxiv; xxxv; and other sections[2] in chaps. i–xxxv have led most contemporary critics to regard such passages either as exilic or as post-exilic. Whence they conclude that the prophetical part of the "First Isaias" is a late compilation from various sources; some truly Isaianic; others, prophetical, Isaianic in spirit, but later than Isaias' day; others, finally, apocalyptic and admittedly late.

[1] Cfr. DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 216 sq.; DELITZSCH, the Prophecies of Isaiah, vol. i, p 376 sq. (Engl. Transl.); etc.

[2] Such sections, for instance, as xi, 10–16; xii; xxiii; xxxiii. Cfr., in their regard, DRIVER, DELITZSCH, BENNETT, CHEYNE, etc.

Digitized by Google

It is true that here, as in connection with other Old Testament writings or parts thereof, the theory of a late compilation from various sources has been spoken of as the outcome of rationalistic views.[1] It is none the less true that most scholars[2] who admit that position are beyond all suspicion of Rationalism. Their arguments are in harmony with elementary canons of literary and historical criticism, which bid us assign each document to the date to which its contents obviously point. Moreover, if their view goes against the title prefixed to the book, it should be borne in mind that titles found in ancient Hebrew writings cannot be relied on implicitly; and further, an old Jewish tradition recorded in the Talmud states that "Ezechias and his college wrote Isaias,"[3] which seems to bear witness to an ancient view according to which Isaias would not be the collector or editor of the prophecies ascribed to him. In fact, on account of that Talmudic statement, Card. Meignan distinctly affirms:[4] "A holy personage other than Isaias, but fully in harmony with the feelings and general conceptions of that prophet, may have been the editor of Isaias' writings"; and again: "Orthodoxy is in no way at stake should the authorship of some of the prophecies contained in Isaias be rejected."

3. Date of Chief Portions and of General Collection (i–xxxv). The advocates of the two opinions just set forth in regard to the method of composition of Isai. i–xxxv, admit practically the same general dates for those

[1] Cfr. KEIL, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. i, p. 297 (Engl. Transl.); VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, n. 914; etc.

[2] Among them may be mentioned BICKELL, DELITZSCH (Isaiah, 4th edit. 1889), DRIVER, G. A. SMITH, etc.

[3] Cfr. "General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," by the present writer, p. 30.

[4] Les Prophètes d'Israel, pp. 233, 259. Cfr. also Card. NEWMAN, On the Inspiration of Scripture, in "the Nineteenth Century," Febr. 1884, p. 196.

Digitized by Google

portions which they hold in common as truly Isaianic. "Isaias' prophecies can be distributed with approximate certainty between four periods: the years before the Syro-Ephraimitic War; the Syro-Ephraimitic War; the last years of the Northern Kingdom; the revolt against Sennacherib and deliverance from him.[1] To us this deliverance is so supremely important that it seems the natural and necessary occasion for most of the propecies referring to Assyria; but the scantiness of our data leaves it possible that other crises seemed equally important to those who lived through them. Subject to this doubt, we may group the acknowledged sections thus:

(1) Before the Syro-Ephraimitic Crisis: ii, 5–iv, 1; iv, 2–6; v, 1–24; vi; ix, 8–x, 4 (+ v, 25–30).
(2) In connection with that Crisis: vii, 1–ix, 7; xi, 1–9; xvii, 1–11.
(3) In connection with the Fall of Samaria: xxviii, 1–6.
(4) Sargon's Invasion, 711 B.C.: xx.
(5) In connection with Sennacherib: i; x, 5–24; xiv, 24–32; xviii xxii; xxiii; xxviii, 7–29; xxix; xxx; xxxi.
(6) Later: ii, 2–4; xxxii.
(7) Uncertain (mostly 723–701 B.C.): xv; xvi; xvii, 12–14; xix; xxi, 13–17."[2]

As regards the date of the other portions of the prophetical part of the "First Isaias," and the general collection itself (i–xxxv), the respective advocates of the two views entertained concerning the method of composition are naturally at variance. Those who maintain that the prophet was the editor of his prophecies think that the general collection (i–xxxv) and its latest portions must be dated from late under King Ezechias. Those who, on the contrary, admit that the present collection is the outcome of a compilatory

[1] Cfr. KEIL, Introd. to the Old Test.; TROCHON, Comm. sur Isaie, in LETHIELLEUX, Bible; VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique; DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of Old Test.; W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction; LESÊTRE, Introd. à l'Ecriture Sainte, etc.
[2] W. H. BENNETT, loc. cit., p. 174.

Digitized by Google

process from various sources—some of which post-exilic—ascribe the prophetical part of the "First Isaias" to a date more or less late after the Exile. Most of the later scholars regard xiii–xiv, 23; xxi, 1–10; xxxiv–xxxv, as exilic; and xi, 10–16; xii; xxiv–xxvii; xxxiii, as post-exilic.[1] For obvious reasons, a more approximate date has not been agreed upon by those scholars concerning such non-Isaianic sections.

§ 3. *Historical Appendix to the "First Isaias" (xxxvi–xxxix).*

1. Its Contents. Besides the prophetical part, the "First Isaias" includes a historical section, in four chapters (xxxvi–xxxix), recording some important events in which the prophet was concerned. Thus chapters xxxvi–xxxvii detail Sennacherib's double summons to Ezechias for the surrender of Jerusalem, together with Isaias' definite predictions of its deliverance, and their sudden fulfilment. The next chapter (xxxviii) narrates Ezechias' sickness and cure; the promise Isaias made to him on that occasion, and Ezechias' hymn of thanksgiving. Lastly, chap. xxxix describes the manner in which Ezechias welcomed messengers from Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon, displaying to them all his treasures, on which account he was reproved by Isaias, who foretold the future spoliation of Juda by the Babylonians.

From a literary standpoint these chapters have been considered as made up of two distinct narratives: (1) chap. xxxvi–xxxvii, 9^a, + verses 37, 38; (2) chap. xxxvii, 9^b–36, + chaps. xxxviii–xxxix.[2]

2. Its Dependence on the Text of the Fourth Book of Kings. Apart from Ezechias' hymn of thanksgiving, which is given only in Isaias (xxxviii, 9–20), and a

[1] Cfr. W. H. Bennett, Driver, G. A. Smith, Cheyne (in Encycl. Biblica, art Isaiah, book), etc.

[2] Cfr. T. K. Cheyne, loc. cit., col. 2203.

Digitized by Google

few, though important, differences, the historical section appended to the "First Isaias" is identical with the narrative in the fourth book of Kings (xviii, 13, 17–xx, 19). The events narrated are the same even in minute particulars; they are given in the same order in both Isaias and the fourth book of Kings; and in both writings the style is practically identical. It is plain, therefore, that the two passages are not only parallel, but also dependent either on each other or on a common source.

But although a real dependence must be admitted, as it is indeed admitted by all scholars who have inquired into the relation of Isai. xxxvi–xxxix to IV Kings xviii–xx, 19,[1] its precise nature cannot be defined with certainty. The more common view is that "the original place of the narratives common to both writings was not the book of Isaias, but the book of Kings, whence they were excerpted (with slight abridgments) by the compiler of the book of Isaias (as Jerem. lii was excerpted from IV Kings xxiv, 18 sqq., by the compiler of the book of Jeremias), on account, no doubt, of the particulars contained in them respecting Isaias' prophetical work, and the fulfilment of some of his most remarkable prophecies, the Song of Ezechias being added by him from an independent source.

"This is apparent (1) from a comparison of the two *texts.* Thus (minor verbal differences being disregarded):

IV Kings xviii, 13 . .	=	Isai. xxxvi, 1.
xviii, 14–16 .	=	* * *
xviii, 17–xix, 37	=	Isai. xxxvi, 2–xxxvii, 38.
xx, 1–6 . .	=	xxxviii, 1–6 (verses 4–6 abridged).
xx, 7–8 . .	=	xxxviii, 21–22 (out of place).
xx, 9–11 . .	=	xxxviii, 7–8 (abridged).
* * * . .	=	xxxviii, 9–20 (Ezechias' Song).
xx, 12–19 . .	=	chap. xxxix (Merodach-Baladan's embassy).

[1] Cfr. TROCHON, loc. cit., p. 6 sq.; JOS. KNABENBAUER, S.J., in Isaiam, p. 593 sqq.; DRIVER; ORELLI; DELITZSCH; etc.

Digitized by Google

"If the places in which the two texts differ be compared, it will be seen that that of Kings has the *fuller* details, that of Isaias being evidently abridged from it:[1] notice especially Isai. xxxviii, 4, 7–8 by the side of IV Kings xx, 4, 9–11 (Isai. xxxvi, 2–3[a], 17–18[a] are related similarly to IV Kings xviii, 17–18[a], 32); Isai. xxxviii, 21–22 (where it is to be observed that the only legitimate translation of the Hebrew ויאמר ישעיהו is, 'And Isaias said' [not '*had* said']) is also clearly in its proper position in the text of Kings.

"This is apparent (2) from the fact that the narrative, as it stands in Isaias, shows manifest traces of having passed through the hand of the compiler of Kings, especially in the form in which Ezechias' prayer is cast (Isai. xxxvii, 15–20 = IV Kings xix, 15–19); in xxxvii, 35[b], where the reference to David is a motive without parallel in Isaias, but of great frequency in Kings;[2] and in chaps. xxxviii, xxxix."[3]

3. Authorship of Chapters xxxvi–xxxix. Scholars who regard Isaias as the author of all the prophecies contained in the book that bears his name naturally ascribe to him the composition of the historical section appended to the prophetical part of the "First Isaias." But besides they set forth special grounds to prove that chaps. xxxvi–xxxix are truly Isaianic. They remind us that since II Chron. xxxii, 32 attributes to Isaias a prophetico-historical monograph respecting the rule of Ozias, we may well suppose that the same prophet wrote a similar work concerning the events under Ezechias and now incorporated in IV Kings xviii–xx, 19 and in Isai. xxxvi sqq.[4] Again, we are

[1] KNABENBAUER, loc. cit., surmises that instead of Isai. xxxvi-xxxix being an *abridgment* from IV Kings xviii sqq., the latter is an *enlargement* of the former by additions from other sources besides Isaias. Dom CALMET, O.S.B., in the eighteenth century, considered Isaias, chaps. xxxvi–xxxix, as derived from IV Kings.

[2] Cfr. III Kings xi, 12, 13, 32, 34; xv, 4; IV Kings viii, 19; xix, 34; xx, 6.

[3] DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of Old Test., p. 226 sq

[4] Cfr. VON ORELLI, loc. cit., p. 196; TROCHON, loc. cit., p. 7.

Digitized by Google

told that the style of this closing section of the "First Isaias" is distinctly the style of Isaias, and in no way that of the writer of the fourth book of Kings.[1] Finally, it is beyond doubt that Isaias mingled historical narrations with his prophetical utterances (cfr. chaps. ii; viii; xx), and that in such historical passages he oftentimes speaks of himself in the third person (cfr. chaps. vii, 3; xx).[2]

It will be easily noticed that even the best of these arguments in favor of the Isaianic authorship of chaps. xxxvi–xxxix—that drawn from the style of Isaias and that of the fourth book of Kings—is too general to be conclusive. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that, on the basis of a more thorough examination of the literary features and historical data of that important section, most scholars refuse to ascribe it to the prophet Isaias. The literary details they have appealed to show apparently that the text of every chapter in that section has passed through the hand of the compiler of the book of Kings before it was embodied in the book of Isaias.[3] In like manner "the narrative which surrounds the prophecy in Isai. xxxvii, 22–32 seems to be the work of a writer belonging to the subsequent generation; for a contemporary of the events related would hardly have attributed the successes against Emath, Arphad, and Samaria (xxxvi, 19), which were in fact achieved by Teglath-Phalasar or Sargon, to *Sennacherib*, or have expressed himself (xxxvii, 38) without any indication—and apparently without any consciousness—that Sennacherib's assassination (B.C. 681) was separated from his invasion of Juda (B.C. 701) by an interval of twenty years. The absence in xxxvii, 36 of

[1] TROCHON, loc. cit. In fact T. K. CHEYNE grants distinctly that "the prophecy in Isai. xxxvii, 21–35 is both in form and in matter stamped with the mark of Isaias" (the Prophecies of Isaiah, 5th edit., p. 218); and DRIVER (Introd. to Lit. of Old Test., p. 227) says: "The prophecy xxxvii, 22–32 bears unmistakable marks of Isaiah's hand."

[2] Cfr. DELITZSCH, Isaiah, vol. ii, p. 77 sq (Engl. Transl.).

[3] For details, see DRIVER, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

all particulars as to time and place points to the same conclusion."[1] It seems likewise from the title of Ezechias' hymn of praise (Isai. xxxix), and chiefly from verse 20, that that canticle was extracted from a late collection of sacred poems designed for liturgical use; all the more so because the hymn does not form part of the original narrative in the fourth book of Kings. For these and other such reasons most contemporary critics regard Isai. xxxvi–xxxix in very much the same light as chaps. i–xxxv, that is as a compilation from various sources, some of which are Isaianic. And there is no denying that such a view gives a reasonable explanation both of the diverse features exhibited by the appendix to chaps. i–xxxv and of its addition to the prophetical part of the "First Isaias."

[1] DRIVER, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XI.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAS.

Section II. Chaps. XL–LXVI.

I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS:

1. Contents of chaps. xl–lxvi.
2. Chief Question concerning Isai. xl–lxvi, viz., Authorship.

II.

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE ISAIANIC AUTHORSHIP OF CHAPS. XL–LXVI.

1. External Testimony of
   - Ecclesiasticus xlviii, 25–27.
   - Josephus (Antiq. of the Jews, book xi, chap. i).
   - New Testament (Quotations and Indirect References).
   - Lists of Old Test. Writings in Septuagint, Josephus, and other Jewish Writers.
2. Connection of Ideas between the two Parts of the Book of Isaias.
3. Comparison of Isai. xl–lxvi with other Old Testament Books.
4. Standpoint of the Writer as Witnessed by chaps. xl–lxvi.
5. Testimony of Language.

III.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE ISAIANIC AUTHORSHIP OF CHAPS. XL–LXVI.

1. The Historical Background
   - as supplied by the Second Section of Isaias.
   - as judged by the Analogy of Prophecy.
2. The Evidence of Language and Style:
   - Isaias' individualities of Style absent.
   - New Images and Phrases appear instead.
3. The Theological Ideas in regard to
   - Their Substance.
   - The Form in which they are Presented.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XI.

THE BOOK OF ISAIAS.

SECTION II. CHAPS. XL–LXVI.

§ 1. *Preliminary Remarks.*

1. Contents of Chaps. xl–lxvi. As we stated in the foregoing chapter, there is no agreement among scholars as to the natural divisions of chaps. xl–lxvi. Formerly they were usually divided into three sections—xl–xlviii; xlix–lvii; lviii–lxvi—chiefly because both chap. xlviii and chap. lvii end with the formula "There is no peace, saith Yahweh, for the wicked," while the last verse of chap lxvi was regarded as an expansion of the same idea. Prof. Driver (and others with him) divides the so-called Deutero- (or Second) Isaias[1] into chaps. xl–xlviii; xlix–lix; lx–lxvi. Another common mode of division is into xl–xlviii; xlix–lxii; lxiii–lxvi. For the purpose of giving the contents of chaps. xl–lxvi it will be convenient to adopt the three following divisions: xl–lv; lvi–lxii; lxiii–lxvi.

The second part of the book of Isaias (xl–lxvi) begins without any heading that would ascribe it to that prophet, although it differs confessedly both from the prophetical part of the "First Isaias," and from the historical appendix which for some time marked the close of the then

[1] The expression "the Deutero-Isaias" should not be understood as implying that the author of chaps. xl–lxvi was also called Isaias; it simply indicates that they are usually regarded as an *independent* second part of the book of Isaias.

Digitized by Google

existing book of Isaias. The aim and general theme of the Deutero-Isaias are stated in the two opening verses: "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, says your God. Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem, and call to her that her time of affliction is come to an end, that her guilt is forgiven, that she has received from Yahweh's hand double for all her sins." The purpose of the whole work is consolatory, and the message it contains is that of a speedy deliverance from severe but too well-deserved punishment.[1]

In the first division (chaps. xl, 2–lv) the topic mostly insisted upon is the certainty of the coming release despite all the obstacles, real or imagined, which might interfere with it. From the very outset (chaps. xl 3–11) the prophet is so sure of coming deliverance that he bids a way to be prepared through the wilderness for the triumphal march of Israel's king bringing to Juda His redeemed people. He then demonstrates in various ways the certainty of that future restoration. "The promised return of the Exiles is guaranteed by the unique deity of Yahweh, which is manifest in Nature and Providence, and especially in the victorious advance of Cyrus, because Yahweh raised him up and announced his coming beforehand (chaps. xl, 12–xli)."[2] After a first passage on the Personal Servant of Yahweh (xlii, 1–4)[3] the writer resumes his thesis. The Jewish remnant will be speedily released by the free grace of Yahweh through Cyrus, His shepherd and anointed, who will bring about the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple. The gods of Babylon cannot hinder God's purpose; they are mere idols. Hence Babylon and its gods must perish ignominiously. Let, therefore, the Jewish captives be ready to depart from that humbled city, and to proclaim

[1] Cfr. Card. MEIGNAN, les Prophètes d'Israel, p. 245 sq.
[2] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 188.
[3] Verses 5–9 are often associated with verses 1–4.

Digitized by Google

everywhere the wondrous story of their return (xlii, 5–xlviii). A second passage on the Personal Servant of Yahweh, describing him as a prophet not only to Jacob, but also to the Gentiles (xlix, 1–6),[1] intervenes; after which Yahweh dispels doubt and depression arising out of Israel's want of faith, by renewed assurances of His power and firm purpose to free His people (xlix, 7–l, 3). In l, 4–9[2] the Servant of Yahweh is again introduced, and is represented as "the persecuted prophet, who shall be vindicated and avenged."[3] Chapters li–lii, 12 are taken up with enthusiastic lyrics (notice the jubilant apostrophes in li, 1, 4, 7; and li, 9, 17; lii, 1, 7) on the prospect of the approaching return and the restoration of the Holy City from its ruin: it concludes with the repeated cry, "Depart." The fourth and last passage on the Servant of Yahweh comprises lii, 12–lii. Yahweh's servant appears in it as a despised martyr, mysteriously suffering for the sins of others, and on that account reaching a great and surprising exaltation. The closing chapters, liv, lv, contrast the future glories of Sion with her present distress and affliction, and bid all the people to accept the assured deliverance.

The second division[4] of the "Deutero-Isaias" opens with a short significant section (lvi, 1–8). Foreigners and eunuchs who keep the Sabbath will be admitted to the privileges of Yahweh's people: "For my house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations." A very different passage follows, including lvi, 9–lvii. It "denounces the idolatry and immorality of the Jews, in the pre-exilic fashion, so that it is often supposed to have been borrowed from a pre-exilic prophet."[5] Chap. lviii describes the

[1] Verses 7–13 are often regarded as parts of the Servant poem.
[2] Verses 10–11 are often joined to verses 4–9.
[3] W. H. Bennett, loc. cit., p. 189.
[4] With it begins what Duhm has called the "Trito-Isaias" (lvi–lxvi).
[5] W. H. Bennett, a Primer of the Bible, p. 76.

Digitized by Google

true fast and the true Sabbath, and is followed in chap. lix, 1–15 by a denunciation of the Jews, which, like lvi, 9–lvii, is often regarded as pre-exilic, but which, being accompanied by a general confession of sin on behalf of Israel, has its best parallel in such post-exilic passages as I Esdras ix; II Esdras i; ix. Yahweh is next described as putting on the armor of righteousness to deliver His people (lix, 15b–21); and Sion is told of the wealth and power, splendor and glory which Yahweh will soon bestow upon her (chaps. lx–lxii).

In the last division of the "Deutero-Isaias," the opening section, somewhat parallel to chaps. xxxiv and lix, 15 sqq., stands by itself. In it Yahweh appears alone in achieving the overthrow of Edom (lxiii, 1–6). The next section (lxiii, 7–lxiv) contains a prayer of intercession for Israel, and is followed by the divine answer to the prayer just recited: Yahweh will inaugurate "new heavens and a new earth" and establish His people in renewed prosperity (lxv). In the last chapter of the book (lxvi) "the prophet, in view probably of the anticipated restoration of the Temple, reminds the Jews that no earthly habitation is really adequate to Yahweh's majesty, and that His regard is to be won by humility and the devotion of the heart (lxvi, 1–5). He concludes (verses 6–24) by two contrasted pictures of the glorious blessedness in store for Jerusalem, and the terrible judgment over her foes."[1]

2. Chief Question Concerning Isai. xl–lxvi, viz., Authorship. A close study of the contents of the "Deutero-Isaias" which have just been set forth briefly, has always suggested to scholars important questions, theological, exegetical, historical, literary, etc. The Messianic and prophetical data supplied by chaps. xl–lxvi

[1] DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of O'd Test. p. 236.

Digitized by Google

have in all ages attracted the particular attention of the apologists of the Christian faith, and this all the more rightly because hardly any other part of the Old Testament Scriptures has been oftener utilized by the sacred writers of the New Testament to establish or illustrate the Messianic character and mission of Our Lord.[1] Owing to the special interest which centred in all such data, it was only gradually that, side by side with the theological and exegetical questions concerning the "Deutero-Isaias," others, chiefly of a literary kind, assumed a real importance. But of late the questions which belong to a special introduction to chaps. xl–lxvi, to wit, the problems regarding the date, place, method of composition, author, etc., of the "Second Isaias," have chiefly engrossed the attention of scholars. One of these in particular, the question of authorship, around which the others naturally gather, is now felt to be of paramount importance. On that account we shall briefly set forth the principal arguments for and against the Isaianic authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi.

§ 2. *Arguments in Favor of the Isaianic Authorship of Chaps. xl–lxvi.*

1. External Testimony Concerning the Authorship. The defenders of the Isaianic authorship appeal first of all to external evidence as proving their position. The earliest testimony they set forth is that of Ecclesiasticus. In chapter xlviii the writer of that deutero-canonical book reviews the history of the kings and prophets of Israel, and in verses 20–28 speaks of King Ezechias and the prophet Isaias. He says:

[1] Thus, for example, the Servant of Yahweh is constantly identified with Christ, cfr. Isai. xlii, 1-4 with Matt. xii, 17-21; xlix, 6 with Acts xiii, 47: lii. 15 with Rom xv, 21; liii, 1 with John xii, 38; Rom. x, 16; liii, with Matt. viii, 17; I Pet. ii, 24 sq.; etc, etc.

Digitized by Google

(Verse 20.) In his [Ezechias'] time Sennacherib came up,
And he sent Rabsaces, and he departed,
And lifted up his hand against Sion. . . .
(23.) And they called upon Yahweh, who is merciful; . . .
And quickly the Holy One heard them out of heaven,
And delivered them by the hand of Isaias.
(24.) He overthrew the army of the Assyrians,
And the angel of Yahweh destroyed them.
(25.) For Ezechias did what pleased Yahweh,
And walked valiantly in the ways of David, his father,
As Isaias the great prophet,
And faithful in his vision, had commanded him.
(26.) In his days the sun went backward,
And he lengthened the king's life.
(27.) With a great spirit, he saw the last things,
And he comforted those who mourned in Sion.
(28.) He showed what should come to pass for ever,
And the secret things before they came.

The prophet so highly praised in this passage is no other than Isaias, the son of Amos, who beheld a "vision" under Ezechias, and was a faithful friend and adviser of that king. What is recorded of him in verses 20–26 points distinctly to the historical appendix to the first part of Isaias, since the same facts are mentioned in both Isai. xxxvi–xxxix and Ecclesiasticus, and in the very same order, since Rabsaces is the only messenger spoken of as sent by Sennacherib in both Ecclesiasticus and Isai. xxxvi, 2, whereas several messengers are mentioned in the parallel narrative in IV Kings xviii, 13, 17; etc. The statements in the following verses of Ecclesiasticus (verses 27, 28), on the other hand, have a direct reference to Isai. xl–lxvi, for the *comforting of the mourners in Sion* (verse 27) reminds us of the general purpose of the "Deutero-Isaias" set forth in its opening words, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people . . .";[1]

[1] The same Hebrew verb, *nahem* (to comfort), is employed in Ecc'esiasticus and Isaias.

Digitized by Google

while the *seeing of the last things* (verse 27) and the *showing of the things that will come to pass* (verse 28) are repetitions of expressions in Isai. xlvi, 10 and xli, 22.[1] Whence it is inferred that Jesus, the son of Sirach, writing about 180 B.C., had before him the book of Isaias as it stands at present, and had no misgiving in regard to the Isaianic authorship of either of its parts. Yea, more: his testimony, it is claimed, should be regarded as embodying an earlier Jewish tradition to the same effect. In fact at the present day unbiassed scholars grant that the son of Sirach bears witness to the Isaianic authorship.[2]

The second external witness in favor of the Isaianic authorship is Josephus (born about 40 B.C.). In his *Antiquities of the Jews*,[3] this celebrated historian, after having quoted after his own fashion Cyrus' decree of restoration[4] in behalf of the Jewish exiles, says: "This was known to Cyrus [that Yahweh wanted him to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem] by his reading the book which Isaias left behind him of his prophecies; for this prophet said that God had thus spoken to him in a secret vision: 'My will is that Cyrus, whom I have appointed to be king over many and great nations, send My people back to their own land, and build My temple.' This was foretold by Isaias one hundred and forty years before the Temple was demolished. Accordingly, when Cyrus read this and wondered at the divine power, an earnest desire seized him to fulfil what was so written." Whatever, therefore, may be thought of the fact

[1] Cfr. W. URWICK, the Servant of Jehovah, p. 4; V. ERMONI, art. Isaie (livre d'), in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 966; etc.

[2] Cfr. for instance, G. WILDEBOER, the Origin of the Canon of the Old Test., p. 133 (Engl. Transl.). Samuel DAVIDSON, who denies in the words of Ecclesiasticus even a reference to distinct parts of the book of Isaias, is clearly biassed (Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p 45).

[3] Book xi, chap. i, §§ 1, 2.

[4] Into Cyrus' decree as recorded in II Paralip. xxxvi. 23. and in I Esdr. i, 2 sqq., Josephus inserted deliberately "for He [God] foretold my name by the prophets."

Digitized by Google

affirmed by Josephus that Cyrus was influenced by reading Isaias' prophecies to free the Jews and rebuild the Temple, it is plain that the Jewish historian knows of the prophet Isaias as the author of chaps. xl–lxvi, wherein alone Cyrus is distinctly named as the future liberator of Yahweh's people.

The third external testimony concerning the authorship is furnished by the New Testament writings. Passages quoted therein from the second part of the book are repeatedly ascribed to Isaias as their author. Thus we read in Matt. iii, 3, "This is he that was spoken of by Isaias the prophet," prefixed to Isai. xl, 3; in Matt. viii, 17, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Isaias," introducing Isai. liii, 4; in Matt. xii, 17, "That it might be fulfilled which is spoken by Isaias the prophet," prefixed to Isai. xlii, 1; in John i, 23, "As said the prophet Isaias," appended to Isai. xl, 3; in Rom. x, 16, "For Isaias says," introducing Isai. liii, 1; in Rom. x, 20, 21, "Isaias is bold, and says," prefixed to Isai. lxv, 1, 2; etc. In connection with these direct quotations, two indirect references to Isai. xl–lxvi are usually set forth as bearing witness to the Isaianic authorship. The first is found in Luke iv, 17, where we are told that in the synagogue of Nazareth "the book of Isaias the prophet was delivered unto Him [Jesus]. And as He had unfolded the volume, He found the place where it was written: 'The Spirit of Yahweh is upon me' . . ." (Isai. lxi, 1 sq.). The second passage is in Acts viii, 28 sqq., where we read that the Ethiopian eunuch "was returning reading the prophet Isaias. . . . And Philip, running thither, heard him reading the prophet Isaias. . . . And the place of the Scripture which he was reading was this: 'He was led as a lamb to the slaughter.' . . ." (Isai. liii, 7, 8). Whence it is readily inferred that the New Testament writers take it for granted,

Digitized by Google

as it was certainly done by their contemporaries, that chaps. xl–lxvi were written by Isaias.

To confirm the foregoing external testimonies, the advocates of the Isaianic authorship appeal to the ancient lists of the Old Testament books. Not only in the Vulgate, but also in the Talmud of Jerusalem, in Josephus, and even in the Septuagint Version, we find Isaias named as one distinct book, and placed first among the greater prophets, manifestly because anterior in the order of time to the other major prophets. It is true that the Talmud of Babylon places Isaias after Jeremias and Ezechiel, but besides naming it as one distinct book, and thereby implying that both of its parts belong to the same prophet, that Talmud states explicitly that this arrangement (Jeremias, Ezechiel, Isaias) is due to the affinity of the contents, not to the time at which the three prophets wrote.[1]

Lastly, it is the practical unanimity and constancy of the Jewish and Christian tradition just set forth in favor of the Isaianic authorship which seems most to make against the opposite view. For if such a tradition is not reliable, we are told, how did it come to pass that "a writer of transcendent genius, admitted by all competent judges to surpass even the greatest writers among the Hebrews, with the exception alone, if exception it be, of Isaias, grew up among the exiles in Babylon, necessarily attracted the attention of his contemporaries, and yet afterwards dropped so entirely into oblivion that his very name and memory perished—not a suspicion or whisper of such separate existence being ever breathed till the thirteenth century of the Christian

[1] The Talmudic passage reads as follows: "But why is not Isaias placed before Jeremias and Ezechiel, since he is anterior to them?—[Answer] The book of Kings ends in the desolation; Jeremias is wholly occupied with it. Ezechiel begins with it and ends with the consolation, and Isaias is wholly occupied with the consolation: thus is the desolation joined with the desolation, and the consolation with the consolation." (The rabbinic text is given by L. T. Wogue, Histoire de la Bible et de l'Exégèse biblique, p. 17.)

Digitized by Google

era"?[1] "In a time when Aggeus and Zacharias so carefully dated their prophecies, how could the name be lost of the seer who had unquestionably done most toward the revival of the theocratic spirit and the home-coming of the faithful ones? The question might be answered if the author appeared pseudonymously under Isaias' name; but no trace of such intention is found anywhere. Whereas in the 'First Isaias' the person of the prophet comes out in different ways, here [in the 'Deutero-Isaias'] all name, even all heading, is wanting! Criticism should honestly confess that the special reason of this anonymity remains in utter obscurity."[2] The only way out of this and other such difficulties, it is concluded, is to admit the validity of the external testimony in favor of the authorship. From the very beginning, the prophecies of Isaias were rightly ascribed to the son of Amos, the prophet who beheld visions under Kings Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias, and tradition ever since has faithfully attributed the writing of them to him.

2. Connection of Ideas between the Two Parts of the Book of Isaias. The second argument brought forth to prove the Isaianic authorship is drawn from an intimate connection of ideas between the two parts of the book of Isaias. It is extremely improbable, it is said, that Isaias should have ended his prophecy with the first part, for this would cast the greatest dishonor on his memory, as a prophet unfaithful to his calling. Israel's corruption and departure from God had become so inveterate as to be incurable by any except the most severe judgments (Isai. i).

[1] Prof. Jno. FORBES, the Servant of the Lord. p. 2. Eben Ezra († 1167), the celebrated Spanish rabbi, was the first to insinuate that chaps. xl-lxvi had been written by Jechonias, at the time of the Babylonian Captivity.

[2] ORELLI, the Prophecies of Isaiah. p. 215 (Engl. Transl.). It should be borne in mind that this learned writer (Von Orelli) is one of the contemporary critics who stand against the Isaianic authorship.

Digitized by Google

To testify this was the occasion of Isaias' calling from the first (chap. vi, 8–13); and now in the chapter immediately preceding this prophecy (i.e., chaps. xl–lxvi) Isaias is commissioned, on occasion of Ezechias' showing all his treasures to the ambassadors of Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon, to announce to him and Israel that "all should be carried to Babylon" (xxxix, 6). With such a denunciation he could not conclude without belying the special functions of the prophetical office. For this office implied two things: the interpretation of the purpose of God's dealings with His people, and also the upholding of their faith under the severity of predicted judgments, by the assurance that they were intended to subserve the accomplishment of the high destiny promised them as God's people. The second part of the book, opening with the words: "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people" (xl, 1), was therefore the indispensable sequel to the judgment just pronounced.[1] The prophet who sustained the faith of the godly Jews for nearly half a century, constantly promising security to the house of David amidst its greatest perils, foretelling the birth of Emmanuel and the laying of a sure foundation in Sion (Isai. xxviii, 16), would not, did not, break off his predictions with the abrupt announcement of the Captivity in Babylon, without adding a single word of comfort for his people in this the direst of all the threatened calamities.

Besides this general connection, many correspondences of ideas, thought to be latent and unobtrusive in themselves, have been pointed out by Dr. Kay[2] as testifying clearly to the unity of authorship of both parts of the book of Isaias. Here are, according to him, minor links that bind Parts I and II indissolubly together:

(1) God abhorred a heartless ritual worship: i, 11, 13—lxvi. 3.

[1] Cfr. Jno. Forbes, loc. cit, p. 5.
[2] In the Speaker's Bible, Isaiah, p. 15 sq.

Digitized by Google

(2) The Lord of Hosts, the Holy One, sat enthroned in "the High and Holy Place": vi, 1—lvii, 15; lxvi, 1.

(3) Yet He regarded the lowly soul that trembles at His word: vi, 5, 6, 7—lvii, 15; lxvi, 2.

(4) Hereafter, He would found a House on His holy mountain for all nations to resort to: ii, 2, 3—lvi, 7; lx, 12-14.

(5) Before Him, every high thing (every mountain and hill) should be made low: ii, 11, 17; v, 15, 16—xl, 4.

(6) This is in pursuance of an all-wise Plan, which is far beyond the reach of man's thoughts, and stands firm in spite of man's opposition: v, 19; xiv, 24, 27; xix, 12; xxiii, 8, 9; xxviii, 29—xl, 13, 14; xliv, 26; xlvi, 10; lv, 9; lxiv, 4.

(7) He overrules even human pride and violence to the working out of His righteous chastisements: x, 5, 7; xxxvii, 26—xlvii, 6; liv, 16.

(8) Israel must be chastised, for they were rebellious children: i, 2, 5; xxxi, 1, 2—lxiii, 8, 10.

(9) The nation, sick and wounded, could be healed only by God: i, 5, 6; vi, 10—liii, 4; lvii, 18, 19.

(10) The people and land are forsaken: vi, 12; xvii, 9; xxvii, 10; xxxii, 14—xlix, 14; liv, 6, 7; lxii, 4, 12.

(11) They are given over to judicial deafness and blindness for a season: vi, 10; xxix, 18; xxxii, 3; xxxv, 5—xlii, 7, 18.

(12) A Remnant should be converted and saved: i, 27; iv, 2, 3; x, 20, 22; xxxvii, 31, 32—xlviii, 10; lix, 20; lxv, 8, 9.

(13) God Himself would come and save them: xxxv, 4—xl, 10; God, their King: vi, 5; xxxiii, 22—xliii, 15; xliv, 6.

(14) One should be born to the house of David, in whom the "sure mercies" promised to David through his son should be realized, and "an everlasting Covenant" established: vii, 14; ix, 6, 7—lv, 3, 4.

(15) In xi, 1 it is foretold of this great scion of David's house that the Spirit of the Lord should rest upon him." The fulfilment is described in lxi, 1.

(16) Israel was to be made fruitful by God's Spirit being poured out upon them: xxxii, 15—xliv, 3, 4.

(17) In v, 2, 7, God has planted a Vine to be "His pleasant *plant*," but laid it waste because it brought forth no "fruit of *righteousness*:" in lx, 21 we read: "Thy people shall be all *righteous*, . . . the branch of *My planting*"; and in lxi, 3: "that they may be called trees of *righteousness*, the *planting* of the Lord."

Digitized by Google

(18) In lxiii, 17: "*Why hast Thou* . . . hardened our hearts from Thy fear?"—a strange challenge, if we had not vi, 10 (comp. xxix, 10) to account for it.

(19) In lxiv, 4 an acknowledgment of God's inconceivably great goodness to "him that waiteth for Him" is followed in verse 7 by "*Thou hast hid Thy face from us.*" This striking yet obscure combination is explained when we recall the fundamental passage, viii, 17: "And *I will wait for the Lord*, that *hideth His face from the house* of Israel."

To these correspondences in ideas and expressions Dr. Kay adds several others, and thinks he has thus made a cumulative and convincing argument for the unity of authorship of both parts of Isaias. Most scholars admit, however, that these and all such connections between the "First" and "Second" Isaias can be accounted for otherwise than by unity of authorship. Many of those correspondences are simply due to the fact that the prophets of Israel proclaimed substantially the same message to the chosen people; others which bespeak an intimate acquaintance with thoughts peculiarly Isaianic can be explained by the great familiarity of a later prophetical writer with the prophecies of Isaias contained in the first part of the book; others, again, perhaps point to the unity of authorship of individual selections, but for the simple reason that the sections wherein such correspondences occur are due to one and the same prophet living in the Exile or after the Exile, as the case may be. In view of these and other such explanations, it is hard to maintain that this second argument, in so far as it is cumulative, carries conviction. In regard to the general connection stated above—viz., that the prophet Isaias who denounced the crimes of Israel and foretold their punishment must also, as a prophet faithful to his mission, have predicted the Return—it may be said that it is one of those *a priori* arguments the proving force of which may well be doubted.

Digitized by Google

3. Comparison of Isai. xl–lxvi with other Old Testament Books. The third argument, oftener insisted on than the one just stated, is grounded on a textual comparison of Isai. xl–lxvi with those "prophetical writings of the Old Testament the authorship and date of which are clearly determined and universally recognized."[1] It is strongly claimed that this comparison of the Deutero-Isaias with the exilic writers Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, and also with the pre-exilic prophets Micheas, Nahum, and Sophonias, establishes the pre-exilic date of Isai. xl–lxvi. It is claimed, first of all, that while Jeremias, who lived at the time of the Babylonian exile, seems to be unknown to the Deutero-Isaias, the latter is clearly acquainted with the prophecies of the former. For instance, Isai. li, 15 is reproduced word for word in Jerem. xxi, 35; again, in Jerem. vi, 15 compared with Isai. lvi, 11, and in Jerem. xxxviii, 3 compared with Isai. xlviii, 6, it is plain that Jeremias simply gives—according to his custom—a different turn to the original passage in Isaias by a slight change of letters;[2] in like manner Jerem. x, 1–16, a passage concerning the nothingness of idols, "is strongly Isaianic in tenor"[3] (cfr. Isai. xli, 7; xliv, 12–15; xlvi, 7); a similar resemblance exists between the words of consolation in Jerem. xxx, 10, 11, and xlvi, 27, 28; "we shall find also in parallels like Jerem. iii, 16 and Isai. lxv, 17; Jerem. iv, 13 and Isai. lxvi, 15; Jerem. xi, 19 and Isai. liii, involuntary Isaianic reminiscences in Jeremias";[4] etc.

The appeal to another exilic prophet, Ezechiel, in favor

[1] Wm. URWICK, the Servant of Jehovah, p. 23.

[2] Cfr. Franz DELITZSCH, the Prophecies of Isaiah, vol. ii, p. 131 (4th edit.).

[3] DELITZSCH, loc. cit., p. 130.

[4] DELITZSCH, loc. cit., p. 131. We refer to DELITZSCH all the more willingly because, in the fourth edition of "The Prophecies of Isaiah" we have quoted from, that distinguished scholar gives up the Isaianic authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi. See also KNABENBAUER, S.J., in Isaiam Prophetam, vol. ii, p. 9 sqq., and authors referred to there.

Digitized by Google

of the pre-exilic date of Isai. xl–lxvi, has been eloquently set forth by Prof. Wm. Urwick[1] in the following terms: "Ezechiel prophesied during the early years of the exile, and we should expect to find some points of resemblance between a work written then and one (the Second Isaias) written in the later years of the Exile. But what we most remark is the striking contrast. We pass into different scenes and times as we pass from our chapters (Isai. xl–lxvi) to Ezechiel. Ezechiel is careful to note repeatedly the year and month of the captivity (cfr. Ezech. xxiv, 1; xl, 1). Three times he mentions Daniel (xiv, 14, 20; xxviii. 3), and frequently speaks of the King of Babylon, naming Nabuchodonosor, xxix, 18, 19; xxx, 10. 'The atmosphere which Ezekiel breathes,' says Dean Stanley,[2] 'the visions by which he is called to his office, are alike strange to the older period; no longer Hebrew, but Asiatic. No longer the single simple figure of cloud or flame, or majestic human form, which had been the means of conveying the truth of the Divine presence to Moses or Isaias, but a vast complexity, wheel within wheel, as if corresponding to the new order of a larger, wider, deeper Providence now opening before him. The imagery that he sees is that which no one could have used unless he had wandered through the vast halls of Assyrian palaces, and there gazed on all that Assyrian monuments have disclosed to us.' Here is graphically described just what we might expect in a prophet living during the exile. But how totally different from what we find in Isaias' last chapter. No reference to Daniel, no mention of Nabuchodonosor, no reckoning of the weary years of exile, no reflection or shadow of the great country in which the exiles lived."

A similar contrast, it is claimed, exists between Isai. xl–lxvi and the book of Daniel. Whichever of the two widely-

[1] The Servant of Jehovah, p. 28 sq.
[2] Jewish Church, vol. ii, p. 565.

Digitized by Google

separated dates (the period of the captivity and the time of the Machabees) be assigned to Daniel, the book is full of historical allusions and descriptions appropriate to the circumstances of the Jewish exiles, whereas the reverse is the case with the second part of Isaias. Hence "the entire absence"[1] of such features from the Deutero-Isaias must point to a period anterior to the Exile.

It must be freely conceded that were the contrast between Isai. xl–lvi and Ezechiel and Daniel as striking as it is affirmed to be by the defenders of the Isaianic authorship, their argument drawn from a comparison between the Deutero-Isaias and the prophets would appear very strong. In reality the contrast is described in an exaggerated manner. "Signs of acquaintance with the nature and customs of Babylonia are not wanting in Isai. xl–lxvi. For example, xliv, 27; xlv, 1 sq., bespeak knowledge of the country which is intersected by main and branch rivers; xliii, 14, knowledge of the traffic enlivening these waterways; chap. xlvii, knowledge of the capital, with its luxurious living, its organized astrology and magic, its markets, the resorts of merchants from far and near; xlvi, 1 names Bel and Nabo as gods of Babylon, in reference to processions with images";[2] etc. Indeed the fact that numerous allusions of the writer to Babylon and Babylonia are both incidental and definite goes a great way toward proving that he lives in Babylonia and addresses fellow captives acquainted with that country. As regards the conclusion in favor of the pre-exilic authorship drawn from a comparison of chaps. xl–lxvi with the prophecies of Jeremias, it should not be considered as truly solid. The original text of Jeremias, as we shall see in the next chapter, passed through several important stages in its

[1] Wm. Urwick, loc. cit., p. 29.

[2] Delitzsch, loc. cit., p. 124 sq. See also Driver, Isaiah (in "Men of the Bible," p. 189 sqq.).

Digitized by Google

composition and transmission.[1] It is therefore probable that the verbal resemblances between it and the text of the Deutero-Isaias are due to the working of passages from chaps. xl–lxvi into the prophecies of Jeremias by a post-exilic editor.

There remains to set forth the inference for the pre-exilic date which is drawn from Isai. xl–lxvi as compared with the pre-exilic prophets Micheas, Nahum, and Sophonias. In the prophecy of Micheas, "a prophecy undeniably written under King Ezechias,"[2] we have a book which, like the Deutero-Isaias, foretells the Babylonian captivity and deliverance from it (Mich. iv, 10); describes the devastation of Jerusalem and Juda (i, 9, 12; ii, 4, 10); predicts the restoration (ii, 12; iv, 1 sqq.); "has a predominance of comfort, and is large and flowing in its descriptions of mercy to come."[3] Whence it is inferred that Isai., xl–lxvi should be considered as pre-exilic, just as well as the book of Micheas. A similar conclusion is drawn from the prophet Nahum, who lived shortly after Isaias, and seems to have been acquainted with Isai. xl–lxvi, as is shown by a comparison of Nahum i, 15 with Isai. lii, 7; Nah. iii, 4, 5 with Isai. xlvii; Nah. iii, 7 with Isai. li, 19; etc. It is also maintained that Sophonias, who lived under King Josias, and who is wont to quote and gather from other prophets before him, has distinct points of resemblance with the Deutero-Isaias (compare Sophon. ii, 15 with Isai. xlvii, 8; Sophon. iii, 10 with Isai. lxvi, 20; etc.).

Despite the confident manner in which these minor prophets have been appealed to, with a view to establish the pre-exilic date of Isai. xl–lxvi, the reasoning based on them can hardly be urged against the opponents of the

[1] Cfr. Driver, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 270 sqq
[2] Wm. Urwick, loc. cit., p. 27.
[3] Ibid.

Digitized by Google

Isaianic authorship: their compilatory character should, as it seems, be admitted, together with the post-exilic date of several parts of their contents.[1]

4. Standpoint of the Writer as Witnessed by Chaps. xl–lxvi. A fourth and apparently much stronger argument in favor of the Isaianic authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi is derived from what is considered as the actual standpoint of the writer. The defenders of the traditional view take up those prophetic chapters, and affirm that, as witnessed by the prophecy itself, the writer's standing-place is in Palestine. They remind us that in Isai. xliii, 22–24, the prophet reproaches Israel with neglecting the offering of holocausts and sacrifices—a reproach which is suited only to people still in Palestine and within reach of Temple-worship. That the Temple of Jerusalem is still standing is inferred from Isai. lxvi, 20 and lxiii, 18.[2] Again, in lvi, 9–lvii, 10 the allusions of the writer, to the dreadful persecutions under Manasses; to the criminal neglect of Israel's rulers and "shepherds," which, as we know from other sources, existed before the Babylonian exile; and to idolatrous acts practised in Manasses' reign by the people of Jerusalem in the valley of Hinnon, prove that the author, who always speaks in the present, lived in an age long before the Captivity. Many other traits concerning the social and moral condition of the Jews in Isai. lii, 5; lviii, 4; lix, 3 sqq.;[3] or referring to their defective worship of Yahweh (cfr. Isai. lviii, 1–3, etc.), are described in a manner more appropriate to the people still in Juda, than to exiles in Babylon. The exact place where the author writes cannot be Babylonia, since in lii, 11 he says "depart *thence*" (had

[1] These two questions will be discussed in the author's forthcoming treatment of the Minor prophets anterior to the Exile.

[2] Cfr. Card. MEIGNAN, les Prophètes d'Israël et le Messie, p. 247.

[3] Ibid., p. 249.

Digitized by Google

he been in the land of exile at the time of writing, he would have said "depart *hence*"); and since in lvii, 9–11 he addresses Jerusalem as still standing, as still running after the favor of the Babylonian king.[1] Finally, the prophet, in proof of the divinity of the God of Israel, appeals frequently to *fulfilled predictions*, and in particular claims *fore*knowledge of the deliverance by *Cyrus*.[2] Now, it is said, this is of no value if the prophecy dates from the period of the Exile.

Capital has been made of this last part of the fourth argument in favor of the Isaianic authorship. To serve as an unquestionable proof of Yahweh's divinity, it is affirmed, the predictions appealed to as fulfilled, especially those which concern Cyrus' coming and victories, must needs have been made long before the Babylonian captivity.[3] "This reasoning would be of weight if it could be shown that the predictions alluded to were those constituting the prophecy itself: but if the passages are read attentively, it will be seen that they contain nothing which lends support to such a supposition. The prophet's standpoint is indicated in xlii, 9: 'The things that were first, behold they *are come to pass*; and new things do I declare; before they spring forth, I cause you to hear them' (cfr. xlviii, 3); on the ground of prophecies which, as he speaks, *are already fulfilled*, he rests his claim to be heard in the *new* announcements now made by him. The new announcements are, primarily, the capture of Babylon by Cyrus and the release of the Jews, topics to which the prophet repeatedly reverts in the course of chaps. xl–xlviii. What the 'former things' are is not distinctly stated. . . . As Cyrus is alluded to as already 'stirred up' (xli, 2, 25; xlv, 13) at the time when the

[1] Cfr. Card. MEIGNAN, ibid., p. 250 sq.
[2] Cfr. Isai. xli, 21–29; xlii, 9; xliii, 8–10; xlv, 21; xlvi, 9, 10; xlviii, 3–8.
[3] Cfr. KNABENBAUER, in Isaiam, vol. ii, p. 6, and writers referred to there.

Digitized by Google

prophecy opens, it is probable that they were prophecies relating to the early stages of Cyrus' career (cfr. xli, 22, 26 sq.; xliii, 9 ; xliv, 7 ; xlviii, 14). These had been spoken some time before; they had been fulfilled (cfr. xlviii, 3–6[a]); and now *fresh* prophecies are delivered by him relating to events very soon to take place, (cfr. xlviii, 6[b]–8)."[1] As regards the assertion that the author of the prophecy claims *fore*knowledge of the deliverance by *Cyrus*, it cannot be substantiated. The prophet introduces Cyrus as *known*, and only claims *fore*knowledge of what he will do, precisely as Isaias does in the case of Sennacherib (e.g., xxxvii, 33). And this view of the prophet's language is in harmony with every passage in which he either names or alludes to Cyrus. Thus, according to xli, 2 ; xlv, 1, that prince is *already* in movement, and has been taken by the hand, and *will* prosper in his own undertaking.[2]

Most of the passages appealed to as describing pre-exilic circumstances, moral, social, and religious, of the Jews, prove perhaps that some sections in chaps. xl–lxvi were written before the Exile. But the very reason for which such passages may be considered as pre-exilic, viz., the fact that their primary and natural meaning seems to point to a time before the Captivity, forbids most contemporary critics to assign other sections, or rather the great bulk of the Deutero-Isaias, to pre-exilic times. The only theory which seems to many of them to be in harmony with all the facts of the case is that which considers the Deutero-Isaias—like the First Isaias—as a compilation made up of prophecies belonging to various periods of Jewish history.[3]

[1] DRIVER, Isaiah, his Life and Times. p. 188 sq.

[2] Ibid., p. 189, footn. 2. This simple manner of interpreting the various passages where Cyrus is spoken of disposes fully of Bp. HARNEBERG's supposition that Cyrus' name is a later insertion from the margin into the sacred text (Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 337. French Transl.).

[3] The peculiar expression "depart *thence*," in reference to Babylon. in lii, 11, may indeed be understood—in view of the general context (verses 7–12),—as simply the out-

Digitized by Google

5. **Testimony of Language.** The resemblances of style and language noticeable between the two parts of the book of Isaias are a last argument in favor of the Isaianic authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi. It is affirmed that these resemblances are closer than those which exist between any two independent writings of the Old Testament, that they greatly preponderate over the diversities between the two parts of Isaias, and that in consequence they point to Isaias as the writer of both i–xxxix and xl–lxvi.

The most striking features of style and language, which are considered as distinctly Isaianic and yet are common to both parts of the book of Isaias, are the following: (1) The phrase "the Holy One of Israel," applied to Yahweh, which appears everywhere in chaps. i–xxxix,[1] runs also through chaps. xl–lxvi; (2) The introduction of divine words by: "Yahweh saith" (cfr. i, 11, 18; xxxiii, 10; xl, 1, 25; xli, 21; lxi, 9), and their confirmation by the formula: "the mouth of Yahweh hath spoken" (i, 20; xl, 5; lviii, 14);[2] (3) "The frequent recurrence of the word *Tohu* (the *chaos* of Gen. i, 1 (three times in the First Isaias, and seven times in the Second Isaias, almost, as it were, the catchword of both books, much as some modern writers are characterized by the use of phrases like 'the absolute' or 'the eternies'";[3] (4) In both parts of Isaias God is often called "King" (vi, 5; xxxiii, 22; cfr. viii, 21; xli, 21; xliii, 15; xliv, 6), and His royal dominion is celebrated (xxiv, 23; lii,

come of the fact that the prophet places himself in spirit at Jerusalem, and thus speaks of Babylon as a distant place. But the parallel expression in the second part of verse 11: "go out of the midst of HER," seems to imply that primitively, instead of "depart *thence*," the Hebrew had "depart from *Babylon*," as it still reads in xlviii, 20. In Hebrew, *Babel*, the proper name for *Babylon*, is feminine. It may have been omitted in lii, 11. through hatred for that famous city (cfr. Ps. cxxxvi, 8).

[1] This is true only in reference to the acknowledged prophecies of the "First Isaias."

[2] This confirmatory formula is found nowhere else in Scripture.

[3] E. H. PLUMPTRE, Isaiah, in "Old Test. Introductions," edited by C. J. ELLICOTT, p. 253.

Digitized by Google

7);[1] (5) In both parts, too, the divine omnipotence is incidentally called "Yahweh's arm" or "His arm" (xxx, 30; xxxiii, 2; cfr. ix, 20; xvii, 5; xl, 10, 11; xlviii, 14; li, 5; etc.); (6) The figure *epanaphora*, i.e. the repetition of words at the beginning and end of sentences,[2] runs throughout the book of Isaias as a favorite rhetorical phrase (i, 7; iv, 3; vi, 11; xiii, 10; xiv, 25; xv, 8; xxx, 20; xxxiv, 9; xl, 19; xlii, 15, 19; xlviii, 21; etc.); (7) The same holds good of *anadiplosis*, a figure in which the ending of a sentence, line, or clause is repeated and emphasized at the beginning of the next, and which occurs in viii, 9; xxix, 1; cfr. xxi, 9; xl, 1; xli, 27; xliii, 11, 25; li, 9, 12, 17; etc.; (8) "In the same way, the crowding together of short sentences, as in i, 17; xxiii, 10; xlvii, 2—everywhere the same breathless haste in the movement of thought. But there are still more intimate lines of connection. How strikingly, for example, xxviii, 5 and lxii, 3 rhyme together, and also xxix, 23 and v, 7 with lx, 21! And does not the fundamental thought, heard in xxii, 11; xxxvii, 26 (cfr. xxv, 1), that everything realized in history pre-exists as idea, i.e. a mental picture, in God, run through chapters xl–lxvi as a constant echo? And is not what is said in xi, 6 sqq.; xxx, 26; and other places, of the future glorifying of the earthly and heavenly creation, repeated in the second half of the book in grand, elaborate pictures, and partly in the same word, a not un-Isaianic feature, lxv, 25? Also the designation of God as 'Saviour,' found everywhere in chaps. xl–lxvi, has its roots in the sayings of the first part, such as xii, 2; xxxv, 4."[3]

[1] Cfr. DELITZSCH, loc. cit., p. 127.

[2] Here is an example of *epanaphora* (Isai. i, 7):

Your land is *desolate*,
Your country, *strangers* devour before your face,
And it is *desolate*,
As overthrown by *strangers*.

[3] DELITZSCH, loc. cit., p. 127 sq.

Digitized by Google

From these and other such forms of thought and expression,[1] which are common to both parts of Isaias, some contemporary scholars (however in a decreasing number) have inferred unity of authorship. They have endeavored to account for the diversities disclosed by a comparison of the two portions of the book by appealing to the different circumstances of composition. "As he grows old," says Plumptre in this connection,[2] "a writer of genius [like Isaias] develops new thoughts, enlarges his vocabulary, varies his phraseology and style, according to the occasion which leads him to write or the intensity of his emotions. Many, if not most, New Testament students find no difficulty in accepting the Pastoral Epistles as written by St. Paul, in spite of the long list of words found in them which are not found in his other writings, and the peculiarities of style and thought which characterize them." And yet the same scholar, though he admits the unity of authorship, adds significantly: "On the other hand, the history of all literature shows that one writer may, either from pure reverence and love, or from a deliberate purpose of personation, so imbue his mind with the thoughts and language of another, adopt his phrases, reproduce the turns and tricks of his style, that it will not be easy, even for an expert, to distinguish between the counterfeit and the original." More important still than these words of Dean Plumptre are those of Franz Delitzsch, who, after having long maintained Isaianic authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi, and the value of the argument in its favor drawn from the language of the book, wrote thus in the last edition of his valuable Commentary on Isaias:[3] "We may say that the second half of the book of

[1] For fuller information in that regard, see Wm. URWICK, the Servant of Jehovah, p. 36 sqq; Wm. H. COBB's Essays in "the Bibliotheca Sacra," April, Oct., 1881, and Jan., July, 1882; and the Commentaries of KAY, CHEYNE, etc., on Isaias.

[2] PLUMPTRE, Isaiah, p. 253.

[3] Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah, vol. ii, p. 128 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

Isaias (chaps. xl–lxvi) is in course of progressive growth as to its theme, standpoint, style, and ideas throughout the first part (chaps. i–xxxix). But, on the other hand, it is also true that all this does not prove the identity of the two Isaias, but only that the Second Isaias is a disciple of the first, outstripping the master, on whom he is formed."

§ 3. *Arguments against the Isaianic Authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi.*

1. The Historical Background. In the eyes of those who reject the Isaianic authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi the strongest argument for their position is drawn from the historical background of these chapters understood in their obvious sense. With the exception of a few sections, which may be considered as pre-exilic in date on account of their tenor,[1] the historical position of the Deutero-Isaias is, as we are told, "plainly and throughout exilian."[2] The Babylonian captivity is not predicted in chaps. xl–lxvi, but assumed as having already taken place. Those whom the prophet addresses *in person* (cfr. xl, 21, 26, 28; xliii, 10; xlviii, 8; l, 10 sq.; li, 6, 12 sq.; lviii, 3 sqq.) are not the men of Jerusalem, contemporaries of Ezechias, or even of Manasses; they are the exiles in Babylonia (xlviii, 20; etc.). His purpose is to comfort them by the assurance that the time of punishment is coming to an end (xl, 2; xlvi, 13; etc.). Jerusalem and its temple lie still in ruin (xliv, 26, 28; li, 3; lii, 9; lviii, 12; lx, 10; lxiii, 18; lxiv, 9–11); Judæa is ravaged and depopulated (lxii, 4; etc.); and the nation

from the 4th Germ. Edit.). See also CHENEY's strictures on Delitzsch's former position, in CHEYNE, the Prophecies of Isaiah, vol. ii, p. 254 (New York, 1892).

[1] We have already spoken of those sections, in connection with the standpoint of the writer as appealed to by the defenders of the Isaianic authorship. Instead of pre-exilic, the sections in question might be post-exilic (cfr. G. A. SMITH, art. Isaiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 494.

[2] ORELLI, the Prophecies of Isaiah, p. 211.

Digitized by Google

is in exile (xlii, 22, 24; lii, 2, 3, 5; etc.). Numerous are the allusions to the sufferings which the Jews have experienced, or are experiencing, at the hands of the Chaldæans (xlii, 25; xlvii, 6; xlii, 22; lii, 5). The time of the Assyrians lies far behind (lii, 4 sqq.), and the desolation of Jerusalem is of long standing, or "ancient" (lviii, 12; lxi, 4); but the prospect of the return is imminent (xl, 2; xlvi, 13; xlviii, 20; etc.). The Persian conqueror who is to deliver Israel is a well-known hero of the day whom one needs not mention by name to be understood when alluding to him (xli, 2 sqq.; 25); only afterwards is his name given, as it were, casually (xliv, 28); and this prince is spoken of as *already* in movement (xli, 2; xlv, 1). It should also be noticed that "as part of an argument for the unique divinity of the God of Israel, Cyrus, alive and irresistible, and already accredited with success, is pointed out as the unmistakable proof that *former* prophecies of a deliverance for Israel are already coming to pass. Cyrus, in short, is not presented as a prediction, but as a proof that a prediction is being fulfilled."[1] This suggests that chaps. xl–lxvi spring from the last period of the Babylonian exile: Cyrus has already appeared, and is about—according to a *new* prediction—to capture Babylon xlviii, 6; xlv, 3). It is because the return from Exile is so near at hand, so absolutely certain, that the prophet bids the Exiles to be comforted, to dispose themselves to accept the approaching salvation, and be ready for departure from Babylon (li-lii, 12; liv–lv; xlviii, 20; etc.). Even the impenitent, hardened sinners are threatened, not with exile, but with exclusion from the coming deliverance (lxv, 13 sqq.; etc.).

All these data supplied by the second section of Isaias suggest, it is claimed, to the mind of the unbiassed reader the period of the Babylonian exile as that of the writer

[1] G. A. Smith, loc. cit., p. 493.

Digitized by Google

and of his contemporaries, no less effectively than do the following words of Psalm cxxxvi (Heb. cxxxvii):[1]

> By the streams of Babylon we sat down and wept,
> When we remembered Sion,
>
> . . . . . .
>
> How shall we sing Yahweh's song
> In a foreign land?
>
> . . . . . .
>
> O daughter of Babylon, thou doomed one,
> Happy he that pays thee back
> For what thou hast done against us!

In both the Deutero-Isaias and Psalm cxxxvi the Captivity is presupposed, not foretold. Both chaps. xl-lxvi and Ps. cxxxvi have no inscription in the original text, and belong to a large collection which has been ascribed to great names in Israel—Isaias and David respectively; but in neither case is the fact of such a union, as indeed of the ascription of the whole collection either to Isaias or to David, sufficient to counterbalance internal evidence which distinctly points to a later period as the date of composition. In neither case, therefore, is recourse necessary to such a supernatural intervention that either writer[2] was actually transported in vision out of his own time onwards to the time of the Exile; and being thus placed by the Spirit of God in an ideal present, that he describes the circumstances around him in vision, and makes that ideal present a standpoint for his words relative to the past or to the future. This theory of *rapture* has indeed been advocated, in regard to the Deutero-Isaias, by several conservative scholars of the nineteenth century; but as William Urwick—himself a defender of the Isaianic authorship—

[1] Cfr. T. K. Cheyne, Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 2203.

[2] Such a divine intervention as would have enabled David to write Ps. cxxxvi is now commonly rejected as "a groundless conjecture." (Cl. Fillion, les Psaumes, p. 609. Paris, 1893.)

Digitized by Google

writes: "It seems too much like an expedient to meet a difficulty; and Dean Stanley justly describes it as 'a hypothesis without any other example in the Scriptures.' Hengstenberg does indeed refer to Deuter. xxxii, to the earlier portions of Isaias, and to the minor prophets, where he considers this theory illustrated. But the places he refers to can be explained without it. It is, in fact, a bold conjecture introduced to meet an apparent difficulty."[1]

The conjectural character of the theory of *rapture* appears in the strongest light when the historical standpoint of the writer of chaps. xl–lxvi is judged by the "Analogy of Prophecy." "The prophet," says Driver,[2] "to whose thrilling words we listen has no interest in the events of Isaias' age; the deliverer, Cyrus, rivets his gaze; the prospect of return to Sion absorbs his thoughts. Judged by the *analogy of prophecy*, this constitutes the strongest possible ground for supposing that the author actually *lived* in the period which he thus describes, and is not merely (as has been surmised) Isaias immersed in spirit in the future, and holding converse, as it were, with the generations yet unborn. Such an immersion in the future would be not only without parallel in the Old Testament;[3] it would be alien itself to the nature of prophecy. As has been before observed, the prophet *speaks primarily to his contemporaries*, and his predictions rest upon the basis of the history of his time. This principle of prophecy can be exemplified most readily in connection with the Isaianic prophecies in chaps. i–xxxix: Isaias' greatest prophecies

[1] William URWICK, the Servant of Jehovah, p. 11. Cfr. also Card MEIGNAN, les Prophètes d'Israël et le Messie, p. 246. Father FILLION, as already stated, calls a similar theory in regard to the authorship of Ps. cxxxvi "a groundless conjecture."

[2] Isaiah, his Life and Times p. 185 sq.

[3] "The writings of the prophets supply no analogy for such a *sustained* transference to the future as would be implied if chaps. xl–lxvi were by Isaias, or for the *detailed* and *definite* description of the circumstances of a distant age" (DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 238).

Digitized by Google

have, one and all, as their human occasions, the crises and circumstances of his own age. The same principle is observed equally in the case of the other prophets. Jeremias, for instance, predicts the restoration of Israel; but how? He predicts first the exile, then the restoration (chaps. xxx–xxxiii); but he never abandons his own historical position; he speaks uniformly from the period in which he lives; exile and restoration are alike viewed by him as future. Ezechiel, in prophecies written *before* the fall of Jerusalem, does the same (chaps. xvi, xvii). There is *no* analogy for the case of a prophet transported in spirit to a future age, and predicting *from that standpoint a future remoter still.* In the prophecy before us (chaps. xl–lxvi) there is no *prediction* of exile; the exile is not announced as something yet future, it is *presupposed.* Had Isaias been the author, he would, according to all analogy, have predicted *both* the exile *and* the restoration. He would have represented *both*, as Jeremias and Ezechiel do, as lying equally in the future."[1]

2. The Evidence of Language and Style. The foregoing argument, though very strong in itself, is rendered stronger still by the evidence of language and style. Like almost all Biblical writers—like Osee, Jeremias, Ezechiel, in the Old Testament; the Synoptists, St. John, in the New—Isaias exhibits in the prophecies which possess an evident reference to the circumstances of his time well-marked individualities of style. He has a preference for particular words and turns of expression, many of which are used by no other writer of the Old Testament. So that it is only natural to admit that the chapters in the book of Isaias, from which such distinguishing features are absent,

[1] It will be remembered that the prediction of the Exile in Isai. xxxix is treated as borrowed from IV Kings, together with almost all the rest of the Historical Appendix to the First Isaias.

Digitized by Google

and in which new phrases and images repeatedly occur instead, bear the impress of different authorship. In this case "such coincidence cannot be accidental. The subject of chaps. xl–lxvi is not *so* different from that of Isaias' prophecies (e.g.) against the Assyrians as to necessitate a new phraseology and rhetorical form: the differences can only be reasonably explained by the supposition of a change of authors. Isaias, in his earliest, as in his latest, prophecies (chaps. xxix–xxxiii; xxxvii, 22–32, written when he must have been at least sixty years of age), uses the same style and shows a preference for the same figures; and the change of subject in chaps. xl–lxvi is not sufficiently great to account for the marked differences which show themselves, and which indeed often relate to points, such as the form and construction of sentences, which stand in no appreciable relation to the subject treated."[1]

The following are examples of words and phrases occurring repeatedly in Isaianic chapters, and therefore characteristic of Isaias' style, but never found in chaps. xl–lxvi:[2]

1. *The Lord* (Heb. *Adon*), Jehovah of Hosts: i, 24; iii, 1; x, 16, 33 xix, 4.†

2. *Not-gods* (*'elīlīm*): ii, 8, 18, 20; x, 11; xix, 1, 3; xxxi, 7.

3. The figure of Yahweh's showing Himself *exalted* (ii, 11, 17; xxxiii, 5), or *lofty* (v, 16), or *arising* (ii, 19. 21; xxviii, 21; etc.; or *lifting Himself up* (xxx, 18: xxxiii, 3, 10).

4. *To mourn* (*'abal*, unusual word): iii, 26; xix, 8.†

5. *The escaped* (or *body of fugitives*): iv, 2; x, 20; xv, 9; xxxvii, 31, 32.

6. A *trampling down:* v, 5; vii, 25; x, 6; xxviii, 18.

7. The *glory* of a nation, especially with figures signifying its disappearance or decay: v 13; viii, 7; x, 18; xvi, 14; xvii, 3, 4; xxi, 16; xxii, 18.

8. *Rottenness:* iii, 24; v, 24.†

9. *Hay:* v, 24; xxxiii, 11.†

[1] DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 238.

[2] This list is substantially the one given by DRIVER, "Isaiah, his Life and Times." p. 194 sq. The expressions that are marked † are used only by Isaias.

Digitized by Google

10. *Dust* (not the usual word): v, 24; xxix, 5. Rare besides.

11. The figure of Yahweh's hand *stretched out* against a nation or part of the earth: v, 25; ix, 12, 17, 21; x, 4; xiv, 26, 27; xxiii, 11; xxxi, 3. A figure used also by other writers (e.g. Exod. vi, 6), but applied by Isaiah with singular picturesqueness and force.

12. *To hiss* (as a signal): v, 26; vii, 18.

13. *To smear*, of the eyes, i.e. to blind them: vi, 10; xxix, 9; xxxii, 3.†

14. *To be ruined* (unusual word): vi, 11 *bis;* xxxvii, 26 (= II Kings xix, 25).†

15. Figures borrowed from *harvest:* ix, 3 [Heb. 2]; xvii, 5, 11; xviii, 4.

16. *Burden:* ix, 4 [Heb. 3]; x, 27; xi, 25.†

17. *To spur* or *incite:* ix, 11 [Heb. 10]; xix, 2.† A remarkable word.

18. *The thickets of the forest:* ix, 18 [Heb. 17]; x, 34.†

19. The proverbial phrase, "*head and tail, palm-branch and rush*": ix, 14 [Heb. 13]; xix, 15.†

20. The figure of *the fat* reduced to leanness: x, 16; xvii, 4.†

21. *Garden-land:* x, 18; xvi, 10; xxix, 17; xxxii, 15, 16; xxxvii, 24. Very rare besides.

22. *Remnant:* x, 19, 20, 21, 22; xi, 11, 16; xvi, 4; xvii, 3; xxi, 17; xxviii, 5; and in the proper name, *Shear-jashub*, vii, 3. The term expressing Isaiah's characteristic teaching, used by no other prophet except (in less special applications) chap. xiv, 22 ; Soph. i, 4 , Mal. ii, 15; and occurring elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Chron., Esdras, Neh., Esther. (The term used generally for *remnant* is different.)

23. *A consummation and that determined:* x, 23; xxviii, 22. A peculiar phrase; only, besides, borrowed from Isaiah, in Dan. ix, 27.

24. The figure of the *scourge:* x, 26; xxviii, 15, 18.

25. The *swinging* of Jehovah's hand: xi, 15; xix, 16: cf. xxx, 32 "battles of *swinging*").

26. A *flying fiery serpent:* xiv, 29; xxx, 6.†

27. *The devastator:* xvi, 4; xxi, 2; xxxiii, 1. So *devastated:* xv, 1 *bis;* xxiii, 1, 14. (Not very common besides, except in Jeremiah.)

28. *Many* (an uncommon word, not the one usually employed in Hebrew): xvi, 14; xvii, 12; xxviii, 2. Only seven times in Job besides.

Digitized by Google

29. A *treading down:* xviii, 2, 7; xxii, 5.†
30. *To wither* (not the ordinary word): xix, 6; xxxiii, 9.†
31. *To war* (uncommon word): xxix, 7, 8; xxxi, 4.

This list might be readily increased. The expressions which follow are found also in chaps. xxiv–xxvii, and therefore, so far as they go, tend to support the conjecture that these chapters embody elements derived from Isaias; but they never occur in chaps. xl–lxvi.

32. *Storm* (prop. *streaming rain*): iv, 6; xxviii, 2 *bis;* xxx, 30, xxxii, 2. Also xxv, 4 *bis*. Only twice besides in the Old Testament.

33. *Briers and thorns* (an alliterative phrase): v, 6; vii, 23, 24, 25; and figuratively, ix, 18 [Heb. 17]; x, 17. Also xxvii, 4. (*Briers* also in xxxii, 13; neither word elsewhere in the Old Testament.)

34. *Little* (not the usual word): x, 25; xvi, 14; xxix, 17. Only xxiv, 6 besides. A diminutive, derived from the same root: xxviii, 10, 13; only besides in Job xxxvi, 2.

35. *To flee* (not one of the words most commonly used to express this idea): x, 31; xvi, 2, 3; xxi, 14, 15; xxii, 3; xxxiii, 3. In an intensive form, xxiv, 20.

As there are numerous features characteristic of Isaias' style absent from chaps. xl–lxvi, so, conversely, many words and phrases appear exclusively in these chapters (sometimes also in chaps. xiii sq., and xxxiv sq.), and are never found in the prophecies which give independent evidence of belonging to Isaias' own time. Thus:[1]

1. *To choose*, of God's choice of Israel: $41^{8.9}$, 43^{10}, $44^{1.2}$ (cf. 42^{1}, 49^{7}, of the *ideal*, individualized nation); *my chosen*, 43^{20}, 45^{4}, $65^{9.15\ 22}$. So 14^{1}.

2. *Praise* (subst. and verb): $42^{8.10.12}$, 43^{21}, 48^{9}, $60^{6.18}$, $61^{3.11}$, $62^{7.9}$, 63^{7}, 64^{10}.

3. *To shoot* or *spring forth:* 44, 55^{10}, 61^{11a}; esp. metaphorically—(*a*) of a moral state, 45^{8}, 58^{8}, 61^{11b}; (*b*) of an event manifesting itself in history (not so elsewhere), 42^{9}, 43^{19}.

[1] The list given is taken from DRIVER, Introd. to the Literat. of Old Test. p. 238 sqq. For fuller information, see T. K. CHEYNE, Introd. to the Book of Isaiah, pp 255–271 (London, 1895).

Digitized by Google

4. *To break out into singing:* 44^{23}, 49^{13}, 52^{9}, 54^{1}, 55^{12}. Also 14^{7}. Only Ps. 98^{4} besides.

5. *Pleasure:* (*a*) of Yahweh's purpose, 44^{28}, 46^{10}, 48^{14}, 53^{10}; (*b*) of human purpose or business, $58^{3.13}$. More generally, 54^{12}, 62^{4}.

6. *Good will, acceptance* (God's): 49^{8}, 56^{7}, 58^{5}, 60^{10}, 61^{2}.

7. *Thy sons*—the pronoun being feminine and referring to Sion: $49^{17.22.25}$, 51^{20}, 54^{13}, $60^{4.9}$, 62^{5}; cf. 66^{8}. Isaias, when he uses the same word, always says *sons* absolutely, the implicit reference being to God (Dt. 14^{1}): so $1^{2.4}$, $30^{1.9}$.

8. *To rejoice:* 61^{10}, 62^{5}, 64^{4}, $65^{18.19}$, $66^{10.14}$. Also 35^{1}.

9. The phrases, *I am Yahweh, and there is none else* (or *besides*). $45^{5.6.18.21.22}$; *I am the first, and I am the last:* 44^{6}, 48^{12}; cf. 41^{4}; *I am thy God, thy Saviour*, etc.: $41^{10.13}$, 43^{3}, 48^{17b}, 61^{8}; *I am He*, i.e. He who *is*, opp. to the unreal gods of the heathen (from Dt. 32^{39}): 41^{4b}, $43^{10b.13}$, 46^{4}, 48^{12}. No such phrases are ever used by Isaias.

10. The combination of the Divine name with a participial epithet (in the English version often represented by a relative clause): e.g. *Creator* (or *stretcher-out*) *of the heavens* or *the earth:* 40^{28}, 42^{5}, 44^{24b}, $45^{7.18}$, 51^{13}; *creator or former of Israel:* $43^{1.15}$, $44^{2.24}$, 45^{11}, 49^{5}; *thy Savior:* 49^{26}, 60^{16}; *thy* (*your, Israel's*) *redeemer:* 43^{14}, 44^{24}, 48^{17a}, 49^{7}, 54^{8}; comp. 40^{22f}, 43^{16f}, 44^{25-28}, 46^{10f}, 51^{15}, 56^{8}, 63^{12f}. Isaias never casts his thought into this form.

The following words, though found once or twice each in Isaias, are destitute there of any special force or significance, whereas in chaps. xl–lxvi they occur frequently, sometimes with a particular *nuance*, or shade of meaning, which is foreign to the usage of Isaias:

1. *Isles* or *coast:* used *representatively* of distant regions of the earth: 40^{15}, $41^{1.5}$, $42^{4.10.12.15}$, 49^{1}, 51^{5}, 59^{18}, 60^{9}, 66^{19}. In Isaias, 11^{11} (also 24^{15}), where it is used in its primary sense (Gen. 10^{5}) of the isles and coasts of the Mediterranean Sea. The application in c. 40–66 is a marked extension of the usage of Isaias.

2. *Nought* (not the ordinary word): 40^{17}, $41^{12.29}$, $45^{6.14}$, 46^{9}, $47^{8.10}$, 52^{4}, 54^{15}. Also 34^{12}. In Isaias, 5^{8} only (where, however, the original signification of the word is still perceptible).

3. *To create:* $40^{26.28}$, 41^{20}, 42^{5}, $43^{1.7.15}$, $45^{7.8.12.18}$, 54^{16}, 57^{19}, $65^{17.18}$. In Isaias, only 4^{5} in a limited application. The prominence given to the idea of creation in c. 40–66 is very noticeable.

Digitized by Google

4. *Offspring:* 42^{5}, 44^{3}, 48^{19}, 61^{9}, 65^{23}. In Isaias, 22^{24}. Also 24^{1}. Rather a peculiar word. The usage in c. 40–66 is wider and more general than that in 22^{24}, and agrees with the usage of the book of Job, 5^{25}, 21^{8}, 27^{14}, 31^{8}. The word does not occur elsewhere.

5. *Justice* emphasized as a principle guiding and determining God's action: $41^{2.10b}$, 42^{21}, $45^{13.19}$, 51^{5}; cf. 58^{2b}. The peculiar stress laid upon this principle is almost confined to these chapters; comp. however, Hos. 2^{19} [Heb. ^{21}].

6. *The arm of Yahweh* · $51^{5b.9}$, 52^{10}, 53^{1}, 59^{16b} (cf. 40^{10}), 62^{8}, $63^{5.12}$. Hence Ps. 98^{1} (see 59^{16}, 52^{10}). In Isaias, 30^{30}. But observe the greater *independence* of the figure as applied in c. 40–66.

7. *To deck*, or (in the reflexive conjunction) *to deck oneself*, i.e. *to glory*, especially of Yahweh, either glorifying Israel, or glorifying Himself in Israel: 44^{23}, 49^{3}, 55^{5}, $60^{7.9.13.21}$, 61^{3}. In Isaias, only 10^{15} of the saw *vaunting itself* against its user.

8. The future gracious relation of Yahweh to Israel represented as a *covenant:* 42^{6} (= 49^{8}), 54^{10}, 55^{3}, 59^{21}, 61^{8}. In $28^{15.18}$, 33^{8} the word is used merely in the sense of a treaty or compact. Isaias, often as he speaks of a future state of grace, to be enjoyed by his people, never represents it under the form of a *covenant*.

9. *Yea*, used with strong rhetorical force 25 times from 40^{24} to 48^{15}. In Isaias, only 33^{2}. Elsewhere in the book, $26^{8.9.11}$, 35^{2}.

There in addition several words and idioms occurring in c. 40–66 which point to a later period of the language than Isaias' age, for which it must suffice to refer to Cheyne, *Isaiah*, ii. 257 f. (more fully *Introd.* pp. 255–270), or Dillm p. 353. . . .

As features of style may be noticed:

1. The *duplication of words*, significant of the impassioned ardor of the preacher: 40^{1}, $43^{11.25}$, $48^{11.15}$, $51^{9.12.17}$, $52^{1.11}$, $57^{6.14.19}$, 62^{10bis}, 65^{1}. Very characteristic of this prophecy; in Isaias the only examples—and those but partly parallel—are 8^{9b} [21^{9}], 29^{1}.

2. A habit of repeating the same word or words in adjacent clauses or verses; thus 40^{12f} (regulated); v.$^{13\ end}$ and v. $^{14\ end}$ (taught him); v.^{14} (instructed him); 40^{31} and 41^{1} (renewed strength); v.^{6f} (courage, encourage); v.^{8f} (have chosen thee); v.^{13f} (I have holpen thee); 45^{4f} (hast not known me); v.^{5f} (and none else); 50^{7} and ^{9} (will help me); 53^{2} (despised); e.^{3f} (esteemed him); v.^{7} (opened not his mouth); 58^{13} (thine

Digitized by Google

own pleasure); 59^{8} (peace); 61^{7} (double). The attentive reader of the Hebrew will notice further instances. Very rare indeed in Isaias ; cf. 1^{7} (desolate); 17^{5} (ears); 32^{17f} (peace).

3. Differences in the structure of sentences, e.g. the relative particle omitted with much greater frequency than by Isaias.

Finally, in order, as it were, to clinch the argument from style, the opponents of the Isaianic authorship point out many literary features of a more general character marking off the writer of chaps. xl–lxvi from the prophet Isaias. The style of the Deutero-Isaias they describe as more flowing; his eloquence is warmer and bursting out more easily into a lyric strain. His imagery, we are told, is drawn particularly from the sphere of human emotion, and his fondness for figures taken from such sources is most evident in his numerous examples of *personification:* of Sion, for example, as a bride, a mother, a widow; etc.[1]

3. The Theological Ideas of Chaps. xl–lxvi. Whoever admits such differences in language and style between chaps. xl–lxvi and the prophecies of Isaias as to bear out the view that an interval of nearly a century and a half elapsed between the composition of the two writings will naturally expect to find proportionate differences between them with respect to theological ideas. As a matter of fact, opponents of the Isaianic authorship think that, when closely examined, the two parts of Isaias are found to differ in such a way as to imply a real development of religious doctrines, which points to two different periods of Jewish history. The following words of one prominent among them[2] contain a short but substantial presentation of this argument: "The *theological ideas* of chaps. xl–lxvi (in so far

[1] For details, cfr. DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 241 sq.; CHEYNE, Introduction to Isaiah; etc.

[2] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 242 sq. For particulars, see DRIVER'S Isaiah, his Life and Times, pp. 168-180; A. B. DAVIDSON, in "the Expositor" for 1883 and 1884; G. A. SMITH, the Book of Isaiah, in "the Expositor's Bible"; etc.

Digitized by Google

as they are not of that fundamental kind common to the prophets generally) differ remarkably from those which appear, from chaps. i–xxxix, to be distinctive of Isaias. Thus on the nature of God generally, the ideas expressed are much larger and fuller. Isaias, for instance, depicts the majesty of Yahweh; in chaps. xl–lxvi the prophet emphasizes His *infinitude;* He is the Creator, the Sustainer of the universe, the Life-Giver, the Author of history (xli, 4), the First and the Last, the Incomparable One. This is a real difference. And yet it cannot be argued that opportunities for such assertions of Yahweh's power and Godhead would not have presented themselves naturally to Isaias whilst he was engaged in defying the armies of Assyria. But, in truth, chaps. xl–lxvi show an advance upon Isaias, not only in the substance of their theology, but also in the form in which it is presented; truths which are merely *affirmed* in Isaias being here made the subject of reflection and argument. Again, the doctrine of the preservation from judgment of a faithful remnant is characteristic of Isaias. It appears both in his first prophecy and in his last (vi, 13; xxvii, 31 sq.) : in chaps xl–lxvi, if it is present once or twice by implication (lix, 20 ; lx, 8 sq.), it is no *distinctive* element in the author's teaching ; it is not expressed in Isaias' terminology (Heb. *Sh*^{e}*'ar:* x, 20–22; xi, 11, 16; xvi, 4; xvii, 3; xxi, 17; xxviii, 5; cfr. vii, 3), and it is not more prominent than in the writings of any other prophets. The relation of Israel to Yahweh—its choice by Him, its destiny, the purpose of its call—is developed in different terms and under different conceptions[1] from those used by Isaias : the figure of the Messias *King* (Isai. ix, 6, 7; xi, 1 sqq.) is absent; the prophet associates his view of the future with a

[1] Israel is Yahweh's servant, entrusted by Him with the discharge of a sacred mission, and hence cannot now be disowned by its Divine Lord (xli, 8–10; xlii, 19 sq ; xliii, 10; xliv, 1 sq., 21 ; xlv, 4 ; xlviii, 20).

Digitized by Google

figure of very different character, Yahweh's righteous Servant,[1] which is closely connected with his own distinctive view of Israel's destiny.[2] The Divine purpose in relation to the nations, especially in connection with the prophetic mission of Israel, is more comprehensively developed.[3] The prophet, in a word, in whatever elements of his teaching are distinctive, moves *in a different region of thought* from Isaias; he apprehends and emphasizes different aspects of divine truth." "He is a later writer expanding and developing, in virtue of the fuller measure of inspiration vouchsafed to him, elements due, perhaps, originally to a predecessor."[4] Finally, to a certain point, a relation may be traced between the truths which that later writer emphasizes and his historical situation. Throughout chaps. xl–xlviii, for instance, the prophet's aim is to vindicate, as against the pretensions of idolatry, Yahweh's true Deity, and he carries out his purpose with a vigor hardly equalled in any other writing of the Old Testament. The reason of this is naturally found in the circumstances of the time and place: idolatry was practised in Babylon with an imposing magnificence and completeness, and idolaters boasted that their gods were more powerful and wise than Yahweh, whom they considered as conquered, together with His people, by the Babylonian deities. In like manner the peculiar features noticeable in Israel's mission to the nations and in the picture of "Yahweh's Servant," etc., in the Deutero-Isaias

[1] Isai. xlii, 1 sqq; xlix, 1 sqq.; l, 4–9; lii, 13-liii, 12; lxi, 1–3.

[2] To say that the figure of the ideal Servant of chaps xl-lxvi is an *advance* upon that of the Messianic King of Isaias is not correct. It should not be considered as a direct continuation, though perhaps fuller, of one and the same idea. It starts from a different origin altogether: it is *parallel* to it, not a continuation of it. Both representations meet and are fulfilled in the person of Our Lord Jesus Christ, but in the Old Testament they are distinct.

[3] Israel in its *ideal* character is to be the medium of religious instruction to the world: xlii, 1, 4, 6; xlix, 6; etc.

[4] DRIVER, Isaiah, his Life and Times p. 207.

Digitized by Google

are manifestly in relation with the corresponding conditions under which chaps. xl–lxvi were composed. And all this points to a later period in Jewish history as the special period in which the author of the second part of Isaias lived and carried out his mission of consolation to Israel.

§ 4. *Concluding Remarks.*

The foregoing exposition of the arguments which are nowadays appealed to *for* or *against* the Isaianic authorship of chaps. xl–lxvi suggests a few general conclusions. In the first place, it is, to say the least, misleading on the part of certain conservative writers baldly to affirm that the arguments set forth against the authorship are not worth taking into account, that the true reason for which the authorship is rejected is rationalistic bias, etc. Arguments which have been tested and accepted by the great majority of contemporary scholars should not be set aside so lightly; and indeed the foregoing exposition of such arguments, however brief, proves that they are worthy of serious consideration. Many sections in chaps. xl–lxvi bear the distinct impress of the Babylonian exile, so that it is no less difficult to ascribe them to the prophet Isaias than it would be to consider David as the writer of the Psalm "Super Flumina Babylonis" (Ps. cxxxvi). Again, certain differences of style and thought must needs be granted between the two parts of the book, and the question is certainly worth considering which of the resemblances and of the differences in language, thought, etc., are truly predominating, and therefore telling either *for* or *against* the Isaianic authorship. And let it be borne in mind that, once several large sections are granted to be exilic, the whole second part, as it now stands, cannot be regarded as Isaianic. It is indeed true that, chiefly in the early infancy of Biblical

Digitized by Google

criticism, some Rationalists have simply denied the authorship because the second part of the book, if granted to be Isaianic, would contain true, supernatural prophecies. But all genuine scholars of the day have discarded such rationalistic bias and simply weighed the arguments *for* or *against* the authorship on their own merit. Besides, it is clear that to admit that the second part of the book of Isaias is the work of an author writing toward the close of the exile, and predicting the approaching conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, just as Isaias predicted the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib, far from impairing the theological value of the prophecy, rather enhances it. It enables one to point out in a more convincing manner how the whole tone of the prophecy of the future capture of Babylon is a firm ground for admitting that it is *prior* to the events which it declares to be approaching.[1] Nor are the Messianic predictions contained in chaps. xl–lxvi done away with or even weakened by the denial of the Isaianic authorship. For, as Father Corluy, S.J.,[2] well says: "Even though those chapters should not be ascribed to the son of Amos, but to some 'Great Unknown' contemporary with the return from Babylon, it would remain true, all the same, that in those sacred pages the life, passion, and violent death of the Messias are foretold several centuries before they came to pass, and that consequently the finger of God is there."

In the second place, several defenders—and even some opponents—of the Isaianic authorship have remarked that to put the composition of chaps. xl–lxvi in immediate connection with the Babylonian captivity is to make it impossible to explain how the name of the author of such magnificent prophecies was allowed to drop into oblivion. The

[1] For valuable remarks on this particular point. see DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 243.

[2] "La Science Catholique" for March 1889. See also Bp. HANNEBERG's remarks to the same effect (Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 336) (French Transl.).

Digitized by Google

prophetical writings of the Exile and of the period immediately after the Exile are, it is said, not anonymous, and a mistaken ascription to Isaias of chaps. xl–lxvi by Ecclesiasticus so near the supposed date of composition is well-nigh inconceivable. Whence it is inferred that the external evidence in favor of the authorship should be considered as valid. And yet, when it is borne in mind that Jewish tradition oftentimes ascribed to the great men of Israel, such as David, Solomon, Esdras, etc., works which, in whole or in part, they certainly never wrote, its testimony for the Isaianic authorship loses much of its apparent cogency. As we shall see in the sequel, the value of the traditional title to the prophecies of Zacharias is not beyond question, and this seems also to be the case with the contents of other prophetical writings whose authorship was formerly taken too easily for granted, seeing that internal evidence clearly points to their compilatory character. The testimony of the sacred writer of Ecclesiasticus, which is the oldest on record in regard to the Isaianic authorship, does not necessarily prove that authorship. It may be understood as simply bearing witness to the fact that the two parts of this book were already put together as they are in the present day, and regarded at that late date—about 180 B.C.—as written by the great prophet Isaias. Even granting that the compiler of the second part of Isaias did not purposely imitate Isaias' style, and omit his own name, in order that his work of compilation might enjoy greater authority in the eyes of his contemporaries, it is not improbable that the resemblances of style and thought between the two parts of the book, together with other less important reasons, led the editor of the whole work to put side by side the Deutero- with the Proto-Isaias, and to include them all under the same common title of Isaias, as one single work: parallel cases exist

Digitized by Google

in regard to other Old Testament writings, and in all such cases the compilatory character of a book is chiefly made out by a careful study of internal evidence.

Lastly, whatever may be thought of the value of the arguments set forth by the opponents of the authorship, it must be granted that the question itself is one not settled by the authority of the Church. "It does not matter," says Card. Newman in this connection, "whether one or two Isaias wrote the book which bears that prophet's name; the Church, without settling this point, pronounces it inspired.[1] And in a like strain Card. Meignan,[2] whose words are quoted by several Catholic scholars, writes: "One can, without being open to the charge of heterodoxy, defend the thesis against which we have declared ourselves."

The probable manner in which, on the basis of its compilatory character, the book of Isaias gradually assumed its present form is described in a concise way by W. H. BENNETT, "A Primer of the Bible," pp. 77–79.

[1] J. H. NEWMAN, on the Inspiration of Scripture, in "the Nineteenth Century," Feb. 1884, p. 196.

[2] Card. MEIGNAN, les Prophètes d'Israël et le Messie, p. 259 sq.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XII.

JEREMIAS, LAMENTATIONS, AND BARUCH.

I. THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAS:

1. Preliminary Remarks: The Life and Times of the Prophet.
2. Contents:
   - General Characteristics (Prophecy and Biography Combined, etc.).
   - Many proposed Divisions Unsatisfactory.
   - Summary of Contents of Principal Sections.
3. Authorship:
   - The Great Bulk of the Book unquestionably Genuine.
   - Arguments For and Against Authorship of Certain Parts.
   - The Literary Method of Composition.
4. Hebrew and Septuagint Texts:
   - Resemblances and Differences.
   - Respective Value.

II. THE BOOK OF LAMENTATIONS:

1. Title and Place in the Canon.
2. Literary Form and Chief Contents.
3. Arguments For and Against Jeremian Authorship.

III. THE PROPHECY OF BARUCH:

1. Contents of the Book:
   - Leading Sections of the Book Proper (i–v).
   - The Appended Letter of Jeremias (Baruch vi).
2. Original Language and Unity of Composition.
3. Authorship and Date.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XII.

JEREMIAS, LAMENTATIONS, AND BARUCH.

§ 1. *The Prophecies of Jeremias*

1. The Life and Times of the Prophet. Jeremias (Heb. *Yirm'yahu*, shorter form *Yirm'yah*, whence Ἱερεμίας, Jeremias), the second of the greater prophets in the Septuagint and the Vulgate, was of priestly descent. He is described (Jerem. i, 1) as "the son of Helcias,[1] of the priests residing at Anathoth," a town some three miles northeast of Jerusalem. He was called to the prophetical office in the thirteenth year of King Josias[2] (626 B.C., five years before the discovery of the "Book of the Law" by the high priest Helcias), and probably exercised his ministry as a prophet in his native town for some time.[3] He was still young when he received his mission, so that he must have been born under Manasses and grown up under the reaction which that idolatrous king had inaugurated against Isaias' teaching, and which seems to have won over princes, prophets, and priests. Against this baneful influence the faithful prophets of Yahweh, Sophonias and Jeremias, set themselves, under Josias, the pious successor of Manasses. Jeremias thus promoted the religious movement which culminated in the reforms of Josias and the establishment

[1] Jeremias' father was called Helcias, like the high priest who found the "Book of the Law" in the Temple under Josias, but should not be considered as one and the same person with him.

[2] Cfr. Jerem. i, 2; xxv, 3.

[3] Jerem. xi, 21.

Digitized by Google

of the Deuteronomic Law, but also drew upon himself the hatred of the heathenizing party. In fact, except perhaps during the remainder of Josias' reign, the ministry of Jeremias was thwarted by that faction which was Egyptian in politics and heathenizing in religion, while he fearlessly stood up for Yahweh's pure worship and for Babylonian influence in the affairs of his country. Well indeed might he lament the defeat and death of Josias on the battle-field of Mageddo,[1] for it was construed by his enemies into a distinct repudiation by heaven of the Deuteronomic reforms, of Jeremias himself and his political views. The Egyptian party regained its supremacy under Joakim, the Judean appointee of the Egyptian monarch, Nechao. It is true that Nechao's defeat at Carchemis by Nabuchodonosor placed Western Asia once more at the disposal of the Babylonian kings, and showed the wisdom of the policy advocated by Jeremias and his friends. But despite Jeremias' counsels, and though maintained on the Jewish throne by the Babylonian monarch, Joakim never accepted fully his condition of Babylonian vassalage. In vain did Jeremias battle against the pro-Egyptian policy of the government, do his best to purify social life and the administration of justice, and to reform religious faith and worship, threatening his contemporaries even with the future destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple. He was universally unpopular and at times barely escaped with his life. At length Joakim rebelled, but died just in time to escape the vengeance of Nabuchodonosor. His son and successor, Joachim, paid the penalty for the revolt: the Holy City was besieged, the king surrendered at discretion, and he, together with the queen, the principal members of the court, and the leading citizens of Jerusalem, were led to exile in Babylonia. Sedecias, Joachim's uncle, swore allegiance to Nabuchod-

[1] Cfr. II Paralip. xxxv, 24, 25.

Digitized by Google

onosor and became king of Juda. Soon, however, he compromised himself by negotiations with Pharao Ophra, despite the solemn warnings of Jeremias. This led to a fresh Babylonian invasion and a new siege of Jerusalem. Yahweh's prophet then proclaimed the success of the enemy, urged the king to submit, and declared those only safe who would desert to the besiegers. He was therefore imprisoned as a traitor and nearly starved to death. After the surrender of the Holy City the victors allowed him to remain where he pleased. He threw in his lot with the Jewish population which was left in Juda, but was carried by them into Egypt, where they withdrew for fear of Nabuchodonosor. It is not improbable that, tired with his denunciations of their idolatry, these Jewish refugees stoned him to death ;[1] but traditions regarding the manner of his death are conflicting.[2]

2. Contents of the Book of Jeremias. The foregoing account of the Life and Times of the prophet Jeremias is almost entirely derived from the contents of his prophecies. This is due to the fact that the book of Jeremias presents among its general characteristics a wonderful combination of prophetical oracles and historical narratives. In no other prophetical writing is the history of the period —of the principal parties in Juda and their leaders ; of the fears and hopes of the people at large ; of the various events of the time, great and small, and of their consequences; of the persecutions raised against Jeremias, their cause, their development; etc.—set forth in such detail and so mingled with the public discourses of the prophet. Numerous sections, some of them considerable in extent (for instance,

[1] Cfr. TERTULLIAN, Scorpiace, chap. viii ; St. JEROME, against Jovinian, ii, 3 (MIGNE, P. Lat., vol. xxiii. col. 335) ; etc.

[2] "The ascription to Jeremias of Deuteronomy, Kings, certain Psalms, etc., rests on no good evidence. Jeremias has often been held to be the original picture of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, Isaias liii." (W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 197, footn. 2.)

Digitized by Google

chaps. xxxvi–xlv), are thus taken up with narrations which bear the manifest impress of being accounts contemporary with the events described, and give to the entire book, not the appearance of what we should term "a collection of Jeremias' prophecies, but a rough equivalent of what we should call 'The Life, Times, and Works of Jeremias.'"[1]

The twofold element—prophetical and historical—which is thus remarkably combined in the prophecies of Jeremias is also steeped in that melancholy which forms another general characteristic of the book. This constant tone of sadness and desolation was noticed many centuries ago by the Talmudists, who thereby explained the insertion of Jeremias, "who is wholly occupied with the desolation," between the book of Kings "which ends in the desolation" and Ezechiel, "who begins with it, but ends with the consolation." The narratives depict him as pre-eminently "the man who had seen affliction," "no sorrow being like unto his sorrow." There fell to his lot more and sharper sufferings than any previous prophet of Israel experienced. Others had only contemplated from afar the forthcoming ruin of Jerusalem and its Temple, and had passed through periods of persecution, but with intervals of repose and an honorable death in the Holy Land. Their prophetical words had sometimes been listened to, and partial reformation of their fellow citizens, together with heavenly blessings bestowed on Israel, had crowned their generous efforts. But not so with Jeremias. All, or nearly all, persecuted him, and he witnessed the departure, one by one, of all his hopes of national reformation and deliverance. From beginning to end he appeared a prophet of evil, and uttered warnings which were disregarded. His duty it was to counsel submission to an alien and pagan conqueror and to incur the reproach of being treacherous alike to God and his country.

[1] W. H. Bennett, loc. cit., p. 199.

Digitized by Google

He witnessed the several invasions of Palestine, the repeated captivities of his people, the utter ruin of Yahweh's Holy Place, and died in a foreign land. Finally, "in every page of his prophecies we recognize the temperament which, while it does not lead the man who has it to shrink from doing God's work, makes the pain of doing it infinitely more acute, and gives to the whole character the impress of a deeper and more lasting melancholy."[1]

A third feature to be mentioned in reference to the general contents of the book of Jeremias consists in the details therein given regarding the composition of that inspired writing. Even a cursory reading of the prophecies discloses an exceptionally large number of definite statements as to the time and place of their delivery. From incidental remarks it appears that Jeremias usually addressed the people in some conspicuous public place, now just outside one of the gates of Jerusalem, now in the court of the Temple.[2] We also learn that it was long after he had begun to prophesy—some twenty years later—that, conformably to a Divine command, he started writing down what he had spoken.[3] Nor did he write himself, but dictated to his disciple Baruch, who wrote, we may suppose, on a roll of roughly-prepared leather. The public reading of these written prophecies made a profound impression upon the people, but the infuriated monarch cut the roll into shreds, and threw them into the brazier which warmed the apartment in which he was sitting. A new and enlarged edition of the prophecies was therefore written by Baruch, Jeremias' scribe.

This narrative of the burning and re-editing of the prophecies of Jeremias[4] is particularly instructive. It sug-

[1] E. H. PLUMPTRE, Jeremiah, in SMITH, Bible Dict., vol ii, p. 1259 (Amer. Edit.).
[2] Cfr. Jerem. xix, 2; xxvi, 2; xxxvi, 5.
[3] Cfr. xxxvi, 1 sq.
[4] Cfr. Jerem. xxxvi for particulars.

Digitized by Google

gests, first of all, that since the divinely-inspired prophet, when re-editing his words, could freely add to them and thereby adapt them to altered circumstances, a subsequent writer, enjoying the same gift of inspiration, could no less freely republish the work of Jeremias, adding to it the narrative of what had occurred after the prophet's time, or was more or less directly connected with him in oral or written tradition. It suggests, in the second place, that since the first edition of Jeremias' written words was subject to the same mishaps, even to destruction, as another book of the time would be liable to, the second, or for that matter any subsequent, edition of the prophet's work would naturally be exposed to all kinds of dangers, in the midst of the times of dire distress in which lived Jeremias and Baruch and their contemporaries and the Jewish exiles after them. "Their country wasted by successive invasions; Jerusalem twice taken, and once sacked and destroyed; hurried flights, like that of Sedecias' men of war 'by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king's garden';[1] long marches into the interior, with all the chances of flood and field; the few precious scraps of roll hastily stowed away in the first receptacle that offered, and then perhaps committed as a last bequest by one dying exile to another. Can we wonder if, when the attempt was made to collect what remained from the wreck, it was attended by serious difficulties? At first there was no central body to make the attempt. Little by little there grew up, and from Esdras onwards we may believe that there flourished, a class of scribes specially devoted to the collecting, transcription, and study of the ancient writings. But in many cases the mischief was done before these came into their hands. Ownerless fragments of MS. were straying about. Portions of the work of one prophet would be mixed up with the work of

[1] IV Kings xxv, 4.

Digitized by Google

another. And the editors into whose hands they came had no clue to discriminate between them. Sometimes mere juxtaposition in place, the fact that two or three rolls or portions of rolls were found together in the same case, might be held to prove identity of authorship. And so nothing would be easier that intrusive matter should sometimes make its way into the later collections, or that the order of a prophet's writings should not be preserved. . . . The longest and the most important of the Prophetic Books have perhaps suffered most; both Jeremias and Isaias from dislocation of order, and Isaias also from the mixing up of anonymous fragments of prophecy with his own." [1]

Whatever may be thought of these various causes of dislocation, to which others might be easily added, the fact itself of a real lack of order in the contents especially of the Hebrew Text of Jeremias is admitted by most scholars, though its extent remains a matter of debate among them. Some—a comparatively few [2]—would confine it to a misplacement of the "Prophecies against the Nations" (chaps. xlvi–li), which they think should be found after chap. xxv, 13 or 14. Others go much farther, and assign to the various parts of the book an order very different from the one now embodied in the Hebrew Textus Receptus. Thus the Catholic scholar F. C. Movers divides the prophecies of Jeremias into six parts, as follows: (1) chaps. i–xx, xxvi, xlvi–xlix; (2) xxx, xxxi, xxxiii; (3) l, li; (4) xxiii, xxii, xxiv; (5) xxi, xxxiv, xxxvii, xxxii, xxxviii–xliv; (6) xxvii–xxix. H. Ewald admits only five parts: (1) chap. i; (2) ii–xxiv; (3) xlvi–xlix, xxv, appendix: xxvi–xxix; (4) xxx–xxxiii, app.: xxxiv, xxxv; (5) xxxvi, xlv, app.: l–lii. F. Hitzig goes much

[1] W. Sanday, Inspiration, in "Bampton Lectures" for 1893, p. 239 sqq.

[2] Among them may be mentioned Cornely, S.J.; Lesetre; etc. The former scholar (Introd Specialis, vol. ii, pp. 384, 387) seems to consider verse 14 of chap. xxv as a later interpolation. In point of fact that verse is not found in the MSS. and authentic edition of the LXX.

Digitized by Google

farther into his division of the books; he regards it as made up of twelve parts, thus: (1) i–xii, 6; (2) xxv; (3) xxvi; (4) xxxv; (5) xxxvi; (6) xlv; (7) xlvi–xlix; (8) xii, 8–xxiv; (9) xxvii–xxix; (10) xxx–xxxiii; (11) l, li; (12) lii. A. Scholz, on the other hand, reduces the divisions to six: (1) i–x; (2) xi–xx; (3) xxi–xxiv; (4) xxv, 1–14, xlvi–li; (5) xxv, 15–xxxiii; (6) xxxiv–xliv; app. xlv and lii.

The marked differences between all such schemes have naturally led some scholars[1] to what may seem to be another extreme position, viz., the pure and simple adoption of the order found in the Massoretic Text. Yet even they do not agree as to the divisions and subdivisions of the prophecies of Jeremias. While Vigouroux, for instance, —followed by Ermoni,—admits as many as four leading parts in the book, together with chaps. i and lii as a Preface and an Appendix, respectively; others, like Trochon—following in this Keil,—prefer to divide the book into only two parts, the first of which would give the prophecies and history relating to the prophet's own country (i–xliv), and the second the prophecies against the Foreign Nations (xlv–li), the last chapter (lii) being also considered as a Historical Appendix. They are still more at variance in regard to the subdivisions of the first part into sections, prophetical discourses, and appendices.[2] From all this it is plain that the arrangements in the Hebrew Text—which is closely adhered to by the Vulgate—does not supply clear and definite data for a systematic division of the contents.

It is true that could we trust the chronological data with which the prophecies of Jeremias are interspersed, we should be able to group them according to the reigns under which they were written or delivered. In fact this method of

[1] For instance, F. DELITZSCH; VIGOUROUX; TROCHON; ERMONI; etc.

[2] Compare, for instance, the subdivisions given by TROCHON (Jérémie, in LETHIELLEUX' Bible, p. 9 sq.) with those accepted by FILLION (Biblia Sacra).

Digitized by Google

dividing the contents of Jeremias has been adopted by several scholars.[1] But even such data do not afford by themselves an absolutely sure means of grouping the contents of that prophetical writing.[2] There remains, therefore, simply to give a brief sketch of those contents according to the various leading sections, without attempt at anything like a systematic arrangement.

After a twofold title (i, 1–2 and i, 3)[3] the first section (i–vi)[4] records Jeremias' call to the prophetic office (chap. i), and contains a series of closely connected discourses upbraiding all classes with their sins, predicting destruction by a distant people who should come from the North and speak a language unknown to the Jews, and foretelling the return and re-establishment of the nation.

In the second section (vii–x)[5] the prophet delivers his message standing at the gate of the Temple, and exhorts the Jews not to trust in that sacred building for protection, but in sincere reform, lest they should experience the fate of the Northern Kingdom. The section concludes (x, 23–25) with Jeremias' words of intercession in behalf of Juda.

The third section comprises chaps. xi–xx. In chaps. xi, xii Jeremias bids the Jews to conform to the covenant of Yahweh which has been recently entered into by Josias and the people (cfr. IV Kings xxii, xxiii), complains of attempts on his life on the part of his priestly kinsmen at Anathoth, and deplores the calamities brought on Juda by its leaders

[1] E. H. PLUMPTRE; W. H. BENNETT; etc.

[2] VIGOUROUX (Manuel Biblique, n. 1004. footn. 1) agrees with Dom CALMET, O.S.B., in regarding the reading: "In the beginning of the reign of SEDECIAS," as the correct one, instead of: "In the beginning of the reign of JOAKIM" (Jerem. xxvii, 1). See also W. H. BENNETT, a Primer of the Bible, p. 34.

[3] Cfr. A. B. DAVIDSON, art. Jeremiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible. vol. ii, p. 572.

[4] In this first section iii, 19 is generally regarded as the immediate continuation of i, 5; and iii, 6–18, which breaks the connection, has a separate heading and a special topic (cfr. W. H. BENNETT, loc. cit., p. 36, and A. B. DAVIDSON, loc. cit.).

[5] In the second section x, 1–16, seems to be foreign to the context, and verse 11 is in Aramaic.

Digitized by Google

and by the evil influence of its neighbors, who will share its punishment. Chap. xviii symbolizes the coming ruin of Juda by the spoiling of a girdle buried by the Euphrates[1] (verses 1–11), likens the filling of all classes in Juda with the wrath of God to the filling of a bottle with wine (verses 12–19), and proclaims that the ingrained sin of Jerusalem shall be punished by shame and destruction (verses 20–27). The following chapters (xiv–xvii, 18) contain Jeremias' repeated but vain prayers for his people, together with his renewed warnings of the future wasting of the land and removal of the Jews for their various crimes. Jeremias complains also of his ungrateful task which exposes him to ridicule and persecutions; whereupon Yahweh encourages him, and bids him not to marry or take part in any festivity. The last part of chap. xvii (verses 19–27) describes the perfect observance of the Sabbath as the condition of national salvation. In chaps. xviii–xx the prophet uses the figure of a potter to set forth Yahweh's absolute mastery over Israel, the work of His hands, and breaks a potter's vessel in presence of the Jewish elders to signify the forthcoming and irrevocable ruin of Juda. Whereupon he was beaten and put in the stocks, by order of the governor of the Temple. The section concludes with Jeremias' bitter denunciation of his persecutors, and solemn curse of the day of his birth.

The fourth section (chaps. xxi–xxix) opens with the prophet's reply to the messengers of Sedecias, who had inquired about the fate of the besieged Jerusalem, that the city will be taken and burnt, and that the only way of escape is desertion to the Chaldeans (xxi, 1–10). Next comes a passage parallel to chap. xvii, 19–27; it is a promise of national salvation directed to the court of Juda, under

[1] The narrative of Jeremias' twofold journey to the Euphrates in this connection is usually interpreted as part of a parable or allegory (cfr. TROCHON, Jérémie (in LETHIELLEUX' Bible), p. 98; VIGOUROUX, Man. Biblique, vol. ii, n. 995).

Digitized by Google

the condition that the king and his attendants shall rule in righteousness (xxi, 11–xxii, 9). This is followed by a strong polemic against Jeremias' opponents: chap. xxii, 10–30 contains judgments on several Jewish kings; chap. xxiii is a denunciation of the shepherds (princes, priests, prophets) of Juda, but also includes the promise of good shepherds, as indeed of the righteous Branch of David, under whom both Israel and Juda shall be restored; chap. xxiv declares that Joakim and his fellow captives are like a basket of good figs, and that the Jews left in Juda are like a basket of bad figs. Chap. xxv foretells the subdual of the Jews by Nabuchodonosor, and the seventy years' captivity, together with severe punishments for various other nations, the Babylonians themselves included. In chap. xxvi Jeremias predicts the destruction of the Temple, and is on that account accused of the capital crime of blasphemy by priests and prophets, but is rescued from death by his friends among the princes. The last chapters of the section (xxvii–xxix) give the history of some episodes of Jeremias' controversy with the prophets. The latter, especially Hananias, favored rebellion against Babylon, and flatly contradicted Jeremias in the name of Yahweh. Then it was that Hananias' speedy death fulfilled Jeremias' prediction concerning him. But the controversy continued between Jeremias and the prophetical supporters of Hananias, who had been carried into exile.

The fifth section (xxx–xxxiii) is chiefly taken up with the prophecies of restoration. After the coming calamity has proved the utter uselessness of foreign alliances and all human help, Yahweh will Himself free His people, lead them back to the Holy Land and set over them "David, their king" (xxx). Nor shall Juda alone be delivered and restored. Israel also, reconciled to Juda, will share in Yahweh's renewed mercy, under a New Covenant, that of

Digitized by Google

inner loyalty to and fellowship with the true God (xxxi). Chapters xxxii and xxxiii reiterate the promises of restoration, concluding (xxxiii, 14–26)[1] with the solemn prediction that the House of David and the Levitical priesthood shall endure for evermore.

The sixth section (xxxiv, xxxv) contains utterances which have no strict connection with either the promises of Restoration in the foregoing section, or the historical chapters (xxxvi–xlv) which immediately follow. Chap. xxxiv predicts that King Sedecias will be taken and carried away into exile, but that his life shall be spared. It declares also that the Jewish nobles shall be punished, because, after Nabuchodonosor had raised the siege for a time, they reclaimed the Hebrew slaves whom they had set free. Chap. xxxv records how, the nomad Rechabites having shown themselves faithful to their tribal customs, Jeremias appealed to their example to shame the Jews, unfaithful to the divine religion of their fathers, and to renew the threat of punishment.

The seventh section (xxxvi–xlv) may be entitled "a History of Jeremias."[2] Chap. xxxvi describes the incidents relating to the twofold dictation of Jeremias' prophecies already mentioned. Chaps. xxxvii–xxxix narrate how Jeremias, arrested as a deserter to the Babylonians, was beaten and imprisoned, how he repeatedly advised Sedecias to surrender, and how he was nearly starved to death, and kept in prison till the sacking of the Holy City, when he was released by the express orders of Nabuchodonosor. Chaps. xl–xliv give an account of Jeremias after the capture of Jerusalem. Released from among the captives, the prophet cast his lot with the Jewish remnant

[1] The genuineness of xxxiii, 14–26 is particularly questioned by critics: it is absent in the Septuagint Version.

[2] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 206.

Digitized by Google

at Masphath, and assured them of God's protection provided they remained in the land. This they refused to do, and went to Egypt, carrying with them Jeremias, who even in that pagan country denounced ruin against Egypt and the Jewish refugees. In chap. xlv Baruch is comforted by the promise that amidst the calamities of the time God will preserve his life.

The eighth and last large section of the book (xlvi–li) is made up of prophecies against Foreign Nations. The most important part of that section comprises chaps. l and li. It contains exultant prophecies of the coming ruin of Babylon, and concludes (li, 59–64) with "a note stating that Jeremias wrote the doom of Babylon in a book and gave it to Saraias, Sedecias' chamberlain, to take to Babylon, read it there, tie a stone to it and throw it into the Euphrates. This book is probably intended to be identified with l, li."[1] Chap. li ends with the formula: "Thus far are the words of Jeremias."

The last chapter (lii) is a Historical Appendix telling of the fall of Jerusalem and the release of Joachin from his prison in Babylon. It is borrowed from the fourth book of Kings (IV Kings xxiv, 18–xxv, 21, 27–30).[2]

3. Authorship. The foregoing account of the contents of the book of Jeremias, however short, enables us to realize something of the difference which exists between them and those of the book of Isaias. In the latter book an entire large section (xl–lxvi) has no direct reference to the person or work of Isaias, and in so far appears connected with him solely by its inclusion with prophecies and narratives concerning him, under the general title of "Isaias." In the book of Jeremias, on the contrary, all the sections, great or small, prophetical or narrative, con-

[1] W. H. BENNETT, loc. cit., p. 208.
[2] Cfr. TROCHON, Jérémie, p. 13 sq.

Digitized by Google

tain distinct references to his words or deeds, and are thereby naturally connected with him. Again, the standpoint of the writer in Isaias is not clearly consistent throughout, inasmuch as chaps. xl–lxvi seem to assume and maintain a historical position different from that taken in the chapters by which they are preceded. The case is different with the book of Jeremias, wherein, from beginning to end, the prophet never loses sight of his own circumstances of time and place,[1] but, on the contrary, uses them as a starting-point for his predictions of woe or of blessing. It is not therefore to be wondered at if, on the basis of the general contents of the prophecies of Jeremias, contemporary critics admit readily that "there is no doubt of the genuine connection of the bulk of the book with that prophet."[2]

This same important conclusion is also borne out by the fact that while the book of Jeremias contains in all its parts many pointed references to even minor events concerning his person, the event of his death is neither mentioned nor so much as intimated. This seems to imply that the book, in its main part, was completed before the prophet's death, and is consequently his work.[3] It is also claimed, though perhaps with less ground in fact,[4] that, since "the book bears almost everywhere the stamp of Jeremias' literary characteristics to a very high degree, doubt of its authenticity as a whole is out of the question."[5]

Disagreement among scholars arises only in connection with the authorship of certain parts of the book. The first

[1] We shall soon see that x, 1–16, addressed to the Exiles, is probably not of Jeremias.
[2] W. H. BENNETT, loc. cit., p. 195.
[3] Cfr. VON ORELLI, the Prophecies of Jeremiah, p. 23 (Engl. Transl.).
[4] Cfr. A. B DAVIDSON, Jeremiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 575 sq., for important remarks in regard to the current conception of Jeremias' style.
[5] VON ORELLI, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

section, the Jeremian authorship of which is often denied, is chap. x, 1–16. According to several scholars of the nineteenth century (among whom may be mentioned Ewald, Keil, Neumann, Trochon, Ermoni, etc.) there is no sufficient reason for ascribing the passage to a later writer, to one who would have lived during the Exile, the Deutero-Isaias, for instance. The section, it is said, contains not a single word that would imply Babylonia as the place of writing. It reads indeed as a warning against Babylonian idolatry, but may have been composed by Jeremias as an admonition to the Northern tribes already in exile. The wording of the passage resembles that of Isaias' denunciations of idol-worship, but this may be accounted for by admitting that Jeremias here imitated Isaias; and further, "from an author of Jeremias' long and diversified literary activity it is unreasonable to expect the same style and turns of phrase."[1]

Over against these negative arguments, many scholars[2] appeal to the following positive grounds as disproving the Jeremian authorship: (1) It interrupts the connection between ix, 22 and x, 17, being entirely foreign to the context; (2) "Jeremias' argument is, 'Expect no help from vain gods; they cannot *save* you' (ii, 28; xi, 12); here the argument is, 'Do not fear them, they cannot *harm* you.' And yet, according to Jeremias' teaching, at the very time to which from its position this section would be referred, Jeremias was prophesying that Juda would shortly be ruined by a nation of idolaters. The descriptions in verses 3–5, 9 imply that the 'House of Israel' addressed is in

[1] ...t., p. 98 See also KNABENBAUER, S.J., in Jeremiam, p. 156, ... vol. i, p. 432; etc.

[2] ...mentioned F. C. MOVERS, the Catholic scholar who examined ...ion of the prophecies of Jeremias that more recent critics can ... thoroughness. (Cfr. Bishop HANNEBERG, Histoire ... French Transl.)

Digitized by Google

presence of an elaborate idol-worship carried on, not by themselves, but by the *heathen*, which, they are emphatically taught, deserves no consideration at their hands. The situation is that of *the exiles in Babylonia*";[1] (3) The passage is parallel to and probably dependent on the Deutero-Isaias (xl, 19–22; xli, 7, 29; etc.); (4) In the phraseology the only noticeable point of contact with Jeremias' style is in verse 15. Again, verse 11—which clearly belongs to the context—when verses 6–8, 10, which are wanting in the MSS. and the authentic edition of the Septuagint, are set aside—is in Aramaic, with certain peculiarities showing that its author must have spoken a particular Aramaic dialect.[2]

The second important passage the Jeremian authorship of which is much questioned is chap. xxv, 11–14, to which are sometimes added verses 9, 10, and 26[b] of the same chapter. Considered as a continuous section, chap. xxv, 9–14 reads in the Hebrew Text, and consequently also in the Vulgate derived from it, like an explicit and accurate prophecy of the duration of the Babylonian exile. Influenced more or less by dogmatic prejudice, several rationalistic scholars have therefore rejected as spurious a passage that would imply distinct and miraculous knowledge of an event seventy years distant. Accordingly some conservatives scholars, apparently more anxious to affirm the prophetical bearing of the passage than to investigate the facts of the case, have repeatedly claimed that the denial of the Jeremian authorship was simply the outcome of rationalistic bias. In reality, as was pointed out long ago, "the Hebrew Text is here furnished with many additions which are not in the Septuagint, and which are due to a later author who wrought over the text designing to make

[1] Cfr. DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 254.
[2] Ibid.

Digitized by Google

the prediction more clear."[1] This is obvious from a simple comparison between the present Hebrew Text and that found in the MSS. and the authentic edition of the Septuagint;[2] and in consequence "nearly all modern critics are of opinion that the original prophecy has here been expanded by a writer who had the entire book (including

[1] De Wette, A Critical and Historical Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii, p. 411 (Engl. Transl., Boston, 1850)

[2] We subjoin an English rendering of the Hebrew and the Septuagint. The single words or expressions in the Hebrew alone are in italics; their absence in the Septuagint is marked by dots:

Hebrew.	Septuagint.
Chap. xxv, 9. Behold I will send and take *all* the kindreds of the north, *saith Yahweh, and Nabuchodonosor, the king of Babylon, My servant*, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about; and I will destroy them and make them an astonishment, and a hissing, and perpetual desolations.	Chap. xxv, 9. Behold I send, and will take . . . the kindreds of the north, . . . and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about; and I will destroy them, and make them an astonishment, and a hissing, and perpetual desolations.
10. And I will take away from them the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones, and the light of the lamps.	10. (The same text as in the Hebrew.)
11. And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment: and these nations shall serve *the king of Babylon* seventy years.	11. And this whole land shall be an astonishment, and they will serve AMONG THE NATIONS . . . seventy years.
12. And when the seventy years are accomplished, I will punish *the king of Babylon and* that nation, *saith Yahweh, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans:* and I will make it perpetual desolations.	12. And when the seventy years are accomplished, I will punish . . . that nation . . . and I will make it perpetual desolations.
13 And I will bring upon that land all My words which I have spoken against it, all that is written in this book which Jeremias hath prophesied against all the nations.	13. And I will bring upon that land all My words which I have spoken against it, all that is written in this book. WHAT JEREMIAS PROPHESIED AGAINST THE NATIONS OF ELAM.
14. *For many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of them also: and I will repay them according to their deeds and according to the works of their hands* (cfr. xxvii, 7).	14. . . . (The whole verse is not in the LXX. Nor is xxvii, 7 in that Version either.)

Digitized by Google

chaps. l, li, to which chap. xxv, 13 alludes) before him."[1] How far this expansion of the original prophecy has been actually carried out is now impossible to define. It has indeed been maintained that since, when 11[b]–14[a] are set aside, the connection becomes natural, it is probable that all these verses are late additions to the original prophecy.[2] But the text, whether in the Hebrew or in the Septuagint (which appears better here than the Massoretic Text), is at present so considerably altered that it is better to refrain from conjecture as regards its primitive reading.[3]

A third section, the original character of which is often rejected, is xxxiii, 14–26. The following are the principal grounds in favor of the Jeremian authorship: (1) Chap. xxxiii, 14–26 is the sole place in the prophecies of Jeremias which contains the disclosure of the wonderful and hidden things promised in xxxiii, 3; (2) The section is intimately connected with chaps. xxx, xxxi, by the similarity of its contents. It carries out what is said in xxxi, 31. And in particular it tallies with xxx, 14, 21, by mentioning explicitly both king and priests;[4] (3) "These oracles so manifestly bear the stamp of Jeremias' style that the suspicion of spuriousness is groundless."[5]

In favor of the opposite view, which has been accepted by such prominent Catholic scholars as Jahn and Movers, and which, according to Driver,[6] is the one maintained by "the majority of recent critics," the following reasons have been set forth: (1) Chap. xxxiii, 14–26 is not in the Septuagint, and this absence cannot be satisfactorily

[1] DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 260. In regard to xxv, 26[b], the words "the king of Sesac (i.e. Babylon) shall drink after them" are not found in the Septuagint, and are most likely a late addition like those in verses 9–14.

[2] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 98.

[3] This remark applies fully to xxvii–xxix, as was admitted long ago by F. C. MOVERS.

[4] Cfr. KNABENBAUER, loc. cit., p. 421 sq.

[5] VON ORELLI, loc. cit., p. 254.

[6] Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 262.

Digitized by Google

accounted for—the suppression of so important a passage by the Greek translators being extremely improbable[1]—except by supposing that it is one of the many late additions to the Hebrew Text of Jeremias; (2) Many of the verses which go to make up the passage are almost literally derived from other places (compare xxxiii, 14, 15, 16 with xxiii, 5, 6; xxxiii, 20–22, 25–26 with xxxi, 35–37); while in xxxiii, 21 the words "with the Levites, the priests, My ministers" are clearly an addition which renders the grammatical constructions clumsy and disturbs the parallelism of the members; (3) It is also argued for the non-authentic character of the passage that it evinces "a keen interest in the Levites which has no parallel elsewhere in the book,"[2] and that the words "*the Levites, the priests*, standing in apposition, do not occur elsewhere in Jeremias."[3] Whence it is inferred that the resemblances in the style with Jeremias can easily be explained by supposing that the insertion was made by means of expressions borrowed from other passages of that prophet, while the various differences betray another writer, later than Jeremias, and whose interpolation had not yet crept into the Hebrew Text when it was rendered into Greek by the Septuagint interpreter. Finally, it may be remarked that the closer the resemblances in style,[4] the greater the harmony of such an interpolation with the immediate and the general context, the more also the addition would have a chance to be accepted as a genuine part of the text.

As regards the section xxxix, 1, 2, 4–13, it is commonly, and indeed justly, regarded as an interpolation by all unbiassed critics.[5] It is true that, according to Keil and a

[1] Cfr. Fried. Bleek, Introd. to Old Test., § 216, *d*.

[2] W. H. Bennett, a Biblical Introd., p. 206.

[3] Samuel Davidson, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii. p. 102.

[4] A. Scholz calls the whole section "ein Mosaik jeremianischer Stellen." Scholz, who rejects the genuineness of xxxiii, 14–26, is one of the few recent Catholic commentators of the book of Jeremias.

[5] Hitzig and Orelli extend the interpolation only as far as verse 10 inclusively.

Digitized by Google

few scholars too ready to abide by his views, "the rejection of xxxix, 1, 2, 4–13 is connected with imaginary historical inaccuracies, the burden of which falls, not upon the text, but only on some of its expositors."[1] They also affirm that the narrative contained in the section is well connected with the immediate and the general context, and that the style of the verses in question is truly that of Jeremias.[2] But all such assertions cannot prevail against plain internal evidence, which all points in the opposite direction. "The last half of the 28th verse of chap. xxxviii should begin the xxxixth chapter, viz.: 'And it came to pass as soon as Jerusalem was taken.' The xxxviiith chapter really ends with the words, 'And Jeremias dwelt in the court of the prison until the day that Jerusalem was taken.' After the beginning, 'And it came to pass as soon as Jerusalem was taken,' we naturally look for the continuation of Jeremias' history, not for an account of the taking of the city itself,[3] which, however, follows immediately in the first and second verses of the xxxixth chapter. The connection is disturbed by the first and second verses; whereas the third verse belongs to the commencing words, 'And it came to pass as soon as Jerusalem was taken.' Hence the suspicion arises that the first and second verses were a later interpolation. This is confirmed by their contents, which are taken from lii, 4–7 and IV Kings xxv. It is worthy of remark that the LXX and Syriac omit the introduction—that is, the last half of xxxviii, 28—perceiving that it did not hang well together with the first and second verses of the xxxixth chapter, though it was undoubtedly authentic. In like manner the passage from verse four to thirteen, inclusive, proceeded from the same interpolator. This ap-

[1] KEIL, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. i, p. 343 (Engl. Transl.).

[2] TROCHON, Jérémie, p. 250; KNABENBAUER, in Jeremiam, p. 465.

[3] In the present Hebrew Text chap. xxxix, 1 goes back to the *beginning* of the siege (DRIVER, loc. cit. p. 263).

Digitized by Google

pears from internal evidence. The diction is not Jeremias'. It is too like an abridgment of lii, 7–16 (or, more probably, of IV Kings xxv, 4–12), from which also it was taken.[1] The history of Jeremias begins with the fourteenth verse, which has a natural connection with the third ; whereas the attachment of the fourth to the third is awkward and unsuitable The whole piece from four to thirteen is evidently an insertion proceeding from one posterior to Jeremias. It is omitted in the LXX, though that fact is not decisive against it. It does not agree well with xl, 1–6 ; at least in the time at which Jeremias was favored by Nabuzardan, and allowed his free choice to go to Babylon or remain in his own land. How could the prophet have been carried as far as Rama in chains, as is related in xl, 1–6, and yet have such favor shown him by Nabuchodonosor as is implied in verses 11–13 of the xxxixth chapter ? "[2]

The genuineness of chaps. l–li has also been much questioned, and is actually given up by many scholars. Its defenders—among whom may be mentioned Küper, Umbreit, Hävernick, Bleek, Nägelsbach, Keil, Graf, Trochon, Cornely, Knabenbauer, and Orelli—rely chiefly on the following arguments : (1) " As concerns the form of these oracles, the literary style of the prophet Jeremias shows itself so frequently and unmistakably therein that, if his authorship be rejected, we must suppose that some one imitated him from a petty desire to be taken for Jeremias. But this is not in keeping with the independence which the author shows, even where he repeats Jeremias' own words ";[3] (2) The epilogue (li, 59–64) to the section bears the peculiar impress of Jeremias' symbolical method of teaching (cfr.

[1] As we shall soon see, chap. lii is not the work of Jeremias.

[2] Samuel DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 104. JAHN and MOVERS rejected chap. xxxix, 1–2, 4–13, long ago, for the same reasons.

[3] VON ORELLI, the Prophecies of Jeremiah, p. 372 (Engl. Transl.). Cfr. l, 40–46 with xiii, 19–21, etc. ; and li, 15–19 with x, 12–16.

Digitized by Google

verse 63), and attests the authenticity of the oracles recorded; (3) "In the utterance itself we find indications that it was composed in Judæa during the existence of the sanctuary at Sion (l, 5; li, 50), and also of the city of Jerusalem (li, 35). Also the words (li, 51), 'strangers are come into the sanctuaries of Yahweh's house,' suit well the time of Sedecias, as stated" in li, 59.[1]

The genuineness is contested by many writers—among whom may be named Ewald, Cheyne, Kuenen, Reuss, Budde, E. Kautzsch, Driver,[2] W. H. Bennett, A. B. Davidson, etc.—on such grounds as the following: The historical situation is that of the Exile. The Jews are in Chaldæa suffering for their sins (l, 4–7, 17, 33; li, 34, 35); but Yahweh is now ready to pardon and deliver them (l, 20, 34; li, 33, 36); the Temple and Jerusalem are in ruins (l, 28; li, 11, 50, 51), but the hour of retribution for their destroyers is at hand (l, 14–16, 21, 29, etc.), while the exiles themselves are bidden to prepare to leave Babylon (l, 8; li, 6, 45, 46, 50). "The *point of view*, also, is not that of Jeremias, either in or about the year 593 B.C. At that time, as we know from chaps. xxvii–xxix, Jeremias was opposing earnestly the prophets who were promising that shortly Babylon would fall and the exiles be restored; he was even (chap. xxix) exhorting the exiles to settle down contentedly in their new home. But the prophet who speaks in l–li, so far from counselling patience, uses all the arts of language for the purpose of inspiring the exiles with the hopes of a speedy release, for doing which the false prophets were severely denounced by Jeremias. . . . Again, the prophecy is not a *mere* declaration of the end of the Babylonian rule; it is animated by a temper which, if it be

[1] Friedrich BLEEK, Introd. to Old Test., § 209 The correct rendering of li, 51 is: "Strangers came *upon* the sanctuaries of Yahweh's house."

[2] DRIVER agrees with Karl BUDDE in regarding li, 59–64 as genuine.

Digitized by Google

Jeremias', is not adequately accounted for. The vein of strong feeling which pervades it, the manifest satisfaction with which the prophet who utters it contemplates, under every imaginable aspect, the fate which he sees imminent upon Babylon, show it to be the work of one who felt far more keenly against the Chaldæans than Jeremias did, who indeed, after the capture of Jerusalem, was treated by Nabuchodonosor with marked consideration (chap. xxxix, etc.), and who, even when in Egypt, still regarded the Babylonian king as carrying out the purposes of Providence (xliii, 10 sqq.; xliv, 30). There breathes in this prophecy the spirit of an Israelite, whose experiences had been far other than Jeremias', who had smarted under the vexatious yoke of the Chaldæans (cfr. Isai. xl, 6, 7; lii, 5), and whose thoughts were full of vengeance for the sufferings which his fellow countrymen had endured at their hands. Other indications support the conclusion thus reached. Jeremias is not, indeed, like Isaias, a master of literary style; but the repetitions and the unmethodical development of the subject which characterize chaps. l–li are both in excess of his usual manner. Jeremias also, it is true, sometimes repeats his own words, but not to the extent which would be the case here if he were the author of chaps. l–li (l, 30–32, 40–46; li, 15–19)."[1]

A third and last view regarding the authorship of chaps. l–li has been advocated by Movers, De Wette, and Hitzig. It affirms that the section, like many other passages in the prophecies of Jeremias, goes back originally to that prophet, but has been considerably interpolated and altered. It is now universally given up.

[1] DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 267. In regard to the style of the section, W. H. BENNETT writes as follows: "Much of the section is borrowed from the rest of the book and from other literature (l, 40–46 = xlix, 18; vi, 22–24; xlix, 19–21; li, 15–19 = x, 12–16. Cfr. l, 39 with Isai. xiii, 21, 22), after the manner of other secondary passages in Jeremias. Except for such borrowing, the style is not that of Jeremias" (a Biblical Introduction, p. 208).

Digitized by Google

The last chapter of the book (lii) is a Historical Appendix, which, as already stated, is borrowed from the fourth book of Kings (xxiv, 18–xxv, 21, 27–30). Its later addition to the prophecies of Jeremias is made manifest, among other things, by the subscription in li, 646: "Thus far are the words of Jeremias." Nevertheless its genuineness has been defended by Hävernick, and is still maintained by Cornely and Knabenbauer. But even Keil[1] and Trochon[2] reject it as an untenable position.

The foregoing study of the authorship of the leading sections in the prophecies of Jeremias, however short and incomplete,[3] prepares us to consider that prophetical writing as a work which reached its present condition only gradually. It proves that, over and above the additions which Jeremias himself introduced into the second edition of his prophecies (cfr. xxxvi, 27–32), others, no less extensive, were inserted after his time. It shows that narrations (for instance, xxxix, 4–13; lii) were added, while prophecies were either amplified, or borrowed from other sources (for instance, xxv, 9–14; xxxiii, 14–26). So that a compilatory process, with its more or less probable stages,[4] should be admitted—as it is indeed generally admitted at the present day—as the literary method followed in the composition of the book of Jeremias.

4. The Hebrew and Septuagint Texts Compared.

The position just assumed, to the effect that the prophecies

[1] KEIL, Introd. to Old Test., vol. i, p. 349 (Engl. Transl.).

[2] Jérémie, p. 14. See also Bp. HANNEBERG, Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 354 (French Transl.).

[3] It might easily be shown that other extensive sections (such, for instance, as xxxvi–xxxix) have actually undergone a considerable amount of revision.

[4] Concerning the probable stages in the composition of the prophecies of Jeremias, see F. C. MOVERS, in HANNEBERG'S Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 352; E. KAUTZSCH, Outline of the History of the Liter. of Old Test., p. 84 sq. (Engl. Transl.); Nathanael SCHMIDT, art. Jeremiah (book), in CHEYNE, Ency Biblica; A. B. DAVIDSON, art. Jeremiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 575; DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of Old Test., p. 271; etc.

Digitized by Google

of Jeremias passed through the different stages of a compilatory process, is further confirmed by a comparison of the Massoretic Text with the Hebrew Text which was rendered into Greek by the Septuagint translator.[1] Both texts are manifestly representatives of one and the same book, and in consequence exhibit about the same general features; roughly speaking, they have the same contents, the same general style and phraseology, the same usual disposition of the sections, etc. Yea, more: they both are furnished with passages which internal evidence proves to be the outcome of gradual accretion, "some additions and insertions having penetrated into all the MSS.; for instance, chaps. l, li, lii, x, 1–16 (except verses 6–8, 10); xvi, 14, 15; xvii, 19–27, and much more."[2] In these respects and several others both texts seem at first sight to have about the same general resemblances as are noticeable between our present Hebrew Text and the Septuagint Version of any other sacred writing of the Old Testament. When more closely considered, however, the Hebrew and Septuagint Texts of Jeremias present differences greater than they are in any other book, even that of Job. Thus the contents of the Septuagint are considerably smaller than those of the Hebrew Text. According to the calculation of Graf, the Greek Text is by about 2700 words, or one eighth of the book, shorter than the Hebrew, and in many cases the parts wanting are not merely single words, but also one or two or more verses at a time.[3] Again, the prophecies against Foreign Nations, which stand at the end of the book in the Hebrew (chaps. xlvi–li), are inserted in the Greek between chap. xxv, 13 and xxv, 15 (verse 14 being wanting in the LXX), and are given

[1] Cfr. DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 271 sq.

[2] A. B. DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 575.

[3] For instance, viii, 10–12; x,6–8; xvii, 1–4; xxix, 16–20; xxxiii, 14–26; xxxix, 4–13, are wanting in the LXX.

Digitized by Google

in an order different from the Hebrew, as may be easily seen in the following schedule:

Hebrew.	Septuagint.
xxv, 15–38	xxxii, 1–24
xxvi, 1–xliii, 13	xxxiii, 1–l, 13
xliv, 1–30	li, 1–30
xlv, 1–5	li, 31–35
xlvi, 1–28	xxvi, 1–28
xlvii, 1–7	xxix, 1–7
xlviii, 1–47	xxxi, 1–44
xlix, 1–5	xxx, 1–5
xlix, 7–22	xxix, 7–22
xlix, 23–27	xxx, 12–16
xlix, 28–33	xxx, 6–11
xlix, 34–39	xxv, 34–39
l, 1–41, 64	xxvii, 1–xxviii, 64

The change in the order of these prophecies may be better realized thus:

	Hebrew.	Septuagint.
Oracle against	Egypt	Elam
" "	Philistines	Egypt
" "	Moab	Babylon
" "	Ammon	Philistines
" "	Edom	Edom
" "	Damascus	Ammon
" "	Cedar	Cedar
" "	Elam	Damascus
" "	Babylon	Moab

Scholars biassed in favor of the Hebrew Text attribute all such differences to the ignorance, carelessness, and incapacity of the Greek translator. They point out how in a certain number of cases he easily misunderstood the text before him, tampered with it to get a suitable continuation, and was satisfied with expressing its general sense, unmindful of the exact wording of his original.[1] They also think

[1] With this end in view, they refer to such passages as ii, 2, 19, 20, 23; viii, 6, 18; x, 17, 18; xii, 13; xv, 10, 16; xviii, 14; xx, 11; xxii, 15, 16, 20; etc.

Digitized by Google

that he was not loath in omitting such clauses as tally with the halting style of Jeremias, but might seem superfluous or difficult to the Hellenist, as also verses which were already contained in the book; etc.[1] There is no doubt that, in many cases, their suggestions of mistaken renderings, intentional omissions, etc., on the part of the Septuagint translator appear plausible, and are, at times, practically certain. It may well be doubted, however, if so one-sided a view of the case is really correct. In fact most contemporary scholars find it exaggerated, and assume that only a part of the variations between the two texts can be accounted for by the faulty manner in which the Greek translation was carried out. "In minor variations the correct text is to be found sometimes in the one edition, sometimes in the other; but the longer—and indeed, at times, most important—passages absent from the Septuagint are probably editorial additions in the Hebrew Text. They do not show that such editorial expansion continued after the text underlying the Septuagint was rendered into Greek, but only that when that translation was made at least two very different Hebrew editions of the book were still current."[2] It seems likewise, though this is much controverted among critics, that the Septuagint, in placing the Prophecies against Foreign Nations in chap. xxv after verse 13, has retained an older order than the one now embodied in the Massoretic Text.[3]

§ 2. *The Book of Lamentations.*

1. Title and Place in the Canon. Besides the collection of prophecies which we have just considered, there is

[1] For examples cfr. VON ORELLI, the Prophecies of Jeremiah, p. 26.

[2] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introd., p. 200. Cfr. KNABENBAUER, S.J., in Jeremiam, p. 10; DRIVER, Introduction, p. 270; A. B. DAVIDSON, art. Jeremiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, v l. ii, p. 574. and authors referred to on p. 575.

[3] Cfr. CORNELY, Introd. specialis, vol. ii, part ii, p 369; A. B. DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 574; etc.

Digitized by Google

another shorter work likewise ascribed to Jeremias among the sacred writings of the Old Testament. Its title in the Hebrew Text is simply *'Ekhah* (How), the opening word of the book. In the Talmud and Rabbinical writings it is usually called *Qinoth*[1] (Lamentations, or Dirges), a name which has its exact equivalent in the Greek θρῆνοι found in the Septuagint and Latinized under the form of *Threni* in the Latin Vulgate. The full title in the official Vulgate is: *Threni, id est Lamentationes Jeremiæ Prophetæ*, whence the ordinary English title of the book: "The Lamentations of Jeremias."

In the Hebrew Canon this book is placed among the *Kethubhim*, as one of the *Meghilloth* (Rolls), between Ruth and Ecclesiastes,[2] and is read in public Jewish services on the day of the Destruction of Jerusalem, viz., the 9th of the fifth month, *Ab* (July–August). In the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and Versions which follow their arrangement of the sacred writings of the Old Covenant, Lamentations stand after Jeremias, and it is probable that at an earlier time those elegies had that position in the Hebrew Canon also.[3] Their mournful words are used in the public services of Holy Week in the Christian Church.

2. Literary Form and Chief Contents. The first four Lamentations are literary compositions which belong to the elegiac poetry of the Bible. This kind of poetry is based on the primitive wail or dirge which was sung on the occasion of the death of individuals, and which, owing to the existence of professional mourners, early attained maturity as a form of literature with metrical and other characteristic features. The Hebrew elegy has a peculiar rhythm

[1] This Hebrew word is found in Jerem. vii, 29; ix, 19, 29; etc., with the meaning of "mournful songs, or lamentations."

[2] Cfr. H. E. Ryle, the Canon of the Old Test., p. 285.

[3] Cfr. Friedrich Bleek, Introd. to the Old Test., §§ 295, 298.

Digitized by Google

which was observed long ago by Bishop R. Lowth, but has been described of late with great success by Karl Budde. According to him "the elegiac verse may consist of one or more members, but each member, which contains on an average not more than five or six words, is divided by a *cæsura* into two unequal parts, the first being usually about the length of an ordinary verse-member, the second being decidedly shorter and very often not parallel in thought to the first."[1] Owing to this lack of antithesis or parallelism between the two members of a verse, these members can be best printed as a single line with a cæsura, as in the following instance, wherein the elegiac Hebrew rhythm can be easily felt even through the English rendering:

> How doth the city sit solitary,—she that was full of people!
> She is become a widow,—she that was great among the nations,
> The princess among the provinces,—she is become tributary.
> (Lament. i, 1.)

Besides the elegiac rhythm, the first four Lamentations present another and indeed more artificial poetical feature. They are alphabetical poems. The first, second, and fourth consist of twenty-two verses, each verse commencing with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet in regular succession and consisting of several lines. The third contains in all sixty-six or thrice twenty-two verses, in the following manner: three verses are allotted to each successive letter of the alphabet, and each of these three verses has the same initial letter as the group to which it belongs.[2]

The fifth and last Lamentation differs considerably in point of literary form from the others. It is indeed poetical, but it has not the elegiac rhythm, and consists simply of distichs in synonymous parallelisms. It may also be con-

[1] Driver, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 457.

[2] The fact that in the second, third, and fourth Lamentations ע comes before פ in the order of letters has not yet been fully accounted for. It should also be noticed that only these three elegies begin with the word *'ekha* (How!).

Digitized by Google

nected in some manner with the Hebrew alphabet, since it contains twenty-two couplets after the number of the Hebrew letters, but it is not an acrostic. It seems, therefore, that though it is not an unstudied effusion of natural feeling, it is not so carefully elaborated a poem as the four Lamentations by which it is preceded.

These differences in literary form coexist with remarkable differences with respect to contents. While it can hardly be doubted that Jerusalem, fallen and ruined by Nabuchodonosor, as long predicted by Jeremias, is the general subject of all the five Lamentations, it remains true that the points of likeness in the treatment of the general subject appear chiefly in the first, second, and fourth elegies, and the points of unlikeness particularly in the third and fifth. "The first dwells on the sad, ruined Sion; the second sings of the 'fons et origo' of the woe of Sion—Yahweh, who at last has carried out the awful threats of punishment on a wicked people; the theme of the fourth depicts the sufferings of the various classes of the people at the hands of their conquerors."[1] So that, thus far, there is both unity and progress in the thought, in harmony with the unity of the literary form. The points of difference begin to appear in the third Lamentation, which is usually regarded as giving vent to the nation's complaint and setting forth its ground of consolation, but is decidedly more personal, the writer speaking of himself as "the man who has seen the affliction," so that some scholars think that the poet, instead of speaking in the name of the community, simply bewails his own misfortunes.[2] But the differences as regards the contents are greatest in regard to the last Lamentation. Not only the elegiac rhythm, which is found in all the Lamentations by which it is preceded, is foreign to

[1] H. D. M. SPENCE, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, in "Book by Book," p. 230.
[2] Cfr. Jno. JAHN, Introd. to Old Test., p. 393 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

its literary form; but its contents are rather those of a prayer[1] than those of an elegy." The elegy proper must begin with the utterance of grief for its own sake. Here, on the contrary, the first words are a petition, and the picture of Israel's woes comes in to support the prayer. The point of rest (observable in the other Lamentations), too, is changed, and the chapter closes under the sense of continued wrath. The centre of the singer's feeling no longer lies in the recollection of the last days of Jerusalem, but in the long continuance of a divine indignation which seems to lay a measureless interval between the present afflicted state of Israel and those happy days of old which are so fresh in the recollection of the poet in the first four chapters (see Lam. v, 20). The details, too, are drawn less from one crowning misfortune than from a continued state of bondage to the servants of the foreign tyrant (verse 8), and a continued series of insults and miseries. And with this goes a change in the consciousness of sin: 'Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne their iniquities' (Lam. v, 7; compare Zachar. i, 2–6)."[2]

3. Arguments For and Against Jeremian Authorship. Despite these and other such differences, which seem to point to the conclusion that all the Lamentations are not by one and the same author, many contemporary scholars ascribe the whole book to Jeremias, the prophet. They appeal first of all to extrinsic evidence. The Septuagint Version affirms explicitly the Jeremian authorship in the following preface to the book: "And it came to pass after Israel was taken captive, and Jerusalem laid waste, that Jeremias sat weeping, and lamented with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and said." This statement is repeated

[1] Hence the heading: "The Prayer of Jeremias, the Prophet," which is prefixed to it in the Vulgate.

[2] W. R. SMITH, art. Lamentations. in Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th edit.

Digitized by Google

in the Latin Vulgate with some slight additions, and is apparently endorsed by Josephus, who, in his Antiquities of the Jews, seems to identify our five canonical Lamentations with those which, according to the chronicler (II Paral. xxxv, 25), Jeremias composed for the funeral of Josias.[1] The Targum, instead of the above preface to the Septuagint translation of the Lamentations, has: "Jeremias, the prophet and chief priest, said," an ascription perhaps independent of both the Septuagint and Josephus. The Talmudists also assume that Jeremias was the author of the book,[2] and the Greek and Latin Fathers, naturally following the preface to the Versions at their disposal, never question the Jeremian authorship.

To confirm this argument from tradition, the defenders of the authorship appeal, in the second place, to internal evidence. The writer, it is said, was clearly an eye-witness of the national misfortunes he bewails, and in fact, like Jeremias, shared in the severe experiences and sufferings of those calamitous times.[3] Further, the book of Lamentations breathes the same spirit as the prophecies of Jeremias, for in both there appears the same sensitive temper, deeply affected by national sorrow, and most ready to pour forth its various emotions;[4] in both, too, the public calamities are ascribed to the same causes, viz., the national break of Yahweh's covenant;[5] unfounded confidence in false prophets and dissolute priests;[6] vain hope of help from weak and faithless allies.[7] Together with this similarity of views, there is found in both writings a striking similarity of

[1] Cfr. JOSEPHUS, Antiquities of the Jews, book x, chap. v, § 1.

[2] Treatise Baba Bathra, fol. 15, col. 1.

[3] Cfr. ii, 11; iii; iv, 17–20; and the whole of chap. v.

[4] Compare the Lamentations with Jerem. xiv, xv, more particularly.

[5] Comp. Lam. i, 5, 8, 14, 18; iii, 39, 42; iv, 6, 22; v, 7, 16, with Jerem. xiv, 7; xvi 10–12; xvii, 1–3; etc.

[6] Comp. Lam. ii, 14; iv, 13–15, with Jerem. ii. 7, 8; v, 31; xiv, 13; xxiii, 11–40; etc.

[7] Comp. Lam. i, 2, 19; iv, 17, with Jerem. ii, 18, 36; xxx, 14; xxxvii, 5–10.

Digitized by Google

images and expressions, which is claimed to point also to unity of authorship. Thus the vivid images of the virgin daughter of Juda or of Sion afflicted with an incurable breach;[1] of the prophet's eyes running down with water;[2] of the sense of terrors on all sides;[3] of direct appeal for vengeance to the righteous Judge;[4] etc., are common to both books. This is also the case with many peculiar words and turns of expression, the principal of which can be easily realized by means of the subjoined schedule borrowed from Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (p. 462):[5]

LAMENTATIONS.	JEREMIAS.
1^{2} (no comforter of all her lovers).	30^{1}.
1^{8b-9}.	$13^{22b.\ 26}$.
1^{16a}, 2^{11a}. ^{18b}, $3^{48.\ 49}$ (eyes running down with tears, etc.).	$9^{1.\ 18b}$, 13^{17b}, 14^{17}.
2^{11}, 3^{48}, 4^{10} (the breach of the daughter of my people); cf. 2^{13} (the breach great), 3^{47}.	6^{14}, $8^{11.\ 21}$; cf. $4^{6.\ 20}$, 6^{1}, 10^{19}, 14^{17b} *al.*
2^{14}, 4^{13} (sins of prophets and priests).	Cf. 2^{8}, 5^{31}, 14^{13f}, 23^{11}.
2^{20}, 4^{10} (women eating their own children).	Cf. 19^{9} (Dt. 28^{53}).
2^{22} ("*my terrors* round about").	6^{25}, 20^{10} ("*terror* round about").
3^{14} (I am become a derision).	20^{7}.
3^{15} (wormwood) ^{19} (wormwood and gall).	9^{15}, 23^{15} (Dt. 29^{17}).
3^{47} (fear and the snare).	48^{43} ("fear and the snare *and the pit*").
3^{52} (they hunt me).	16^{16b}.
4^{21b} (the cup).	25^{15}, 49^{12}.
5^{16}.	13^{18b}.

[1] Comp. Lam. i, 15; ii, 13, with Jerem. viii, 21, 22; xiv, 19.
[2] Comp. Lam. i, 16; ii, 11, 18; iii, 48, 49, with Jerem. ix, 1, 18; xiii, 19; xiv, 17.
[3] Comp. Lam. ii, 22, with Jerem. vi, 25; xx, 10.
[4] Comp. Lam. iii, 64–66 with Jerem. xi 20.
[5] DRIVER's schedule is based on KEIL's data, in the latter's Introd. to the Old Test., § 127 (p. 511 of Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

The many opponents of the Jeremian authorship, whose number is steadily increasing among contemporary scholars, refuse to regard as conclusive the testimony of the tradition which ascribes all the Lamentations to Jeremias. This tradition can indeed be traced back to the short preface to the book of Lamentations in the Septuagint Version. But nothing proves that the preface itself is simply a rendering into Greek of a corresponding piece in the Hebrew original. It does not appear in our received Hebrew Text, and was not found there in St. Jerome's day. Its suppression from the Hebrew Text, since the time of the Septuagint Version, is not probable; all the more so because never since then have Jewish scribes and scholars called in question the Jeremian authorship. Moreover, "it cannot be at once assumed that the tradition embodied in the Septuagint's preface has a genuine historical basis: an interval of at least three centuries separated the Septuagint translators from the age of Jeremias; and the tradition *may*, for example, be merely an inference founded on the general resemblance of tone which the Lamentation exhibit with such passages as Jerem. viii, 18–ix; xiv–xv, and on the reference assumed to be contained in Lam. iii, 14, 53–56, to incidents in the prophet's life (Jerem. xx, 7; xxxviii, 6 sqq.)."[1]

Having thus thrown a serious doubt on the tradition which regards Jeremias as the author of the Lamentations, the opponents of the Jeremian authorship claim that, though the book has parallels to the style and teaching of that prophet, and various passages which seem to have been written by an eye-witness, a comparison of its contents with Jeremias' prophecies disproves the unity of authorship. They maintain, first of all, that the point of view is sometimes at variance with that of Jeremias. For

[1] DRIVER, loc cit., p. 461. See also W. R. SMITH, art. Lamentations, in Encyclop. Britannica, 9th edit.

Digitized by Google

example, in Lam. i, 21, 22; iii, 59–66, the writer gives vent to bitter feelings against the Chaldæans, invoking retribution upon them, but this is hardly in harmony with Jeremias' conviction that the enemies of his nation were simply executing God's purpose upon Juda. In like manner the author of Lam. ii, 9c says that Sion's prophets find no vision from Yahweh, a statement which seems to imply that he is *not* himself a prophet. Again, in Lam. iv, 17 the speaker identifies himself with those who hope for help from Egypt, whereas Jeremias always discouraged such hopes. Considering Jeremias' poor opinion of Sedecias,[1] it is very unlikely that he should speak of him as "the breath of our nostrils, the anointed of Yahweh, . . . of whom we said: Under his shadow we shall live among the Gentiles," etc.

The opponents of the Jeremian authorship claim, in the second place, that the phraseology of Lamentations varies from that of Jeremias. "Lam. contains a very large number of words not found in Jeremias; and though the non-occurrence in Jeremias of several of these must be due to accident, and the non-occurrence of others may be attributed to the peculiar character of Lamentations, and is thus of slight or no significance, yet others are more remarkable; and taken together, the impression which they leave upon an impartial critic is that their number is greater than would be the case if Jeremias were the author."[2] This second argument is now considered as very strong by many writers, among whom may be mentioned the Catholic scholar B. Neteler, who openly says: "Von den Klagelied hat Nägelsbach[3] in vollständig überzeugender Weise bewiesen, dass sie wegen ihrer grossen

[1] Cfr. Jerem. xxiv, 8–10; etc.

[2] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 463, and footn. 2, where are given examples of words exclusively found in Lamentations.

[3] Nägelsbach is one of the commentators of the nineteenth century who have compared most carefully the style of Lamentations with that of Jeremias.

Digitized by Google

sprachlichen Verschiedenheit vom Buche Jeremias von dem Verfasser dieses Buches nicht herrühren können."[1]

Finally, it is argued that the variation in the alphabetic order which has been already noticed in connection with the literary form of Lam. ii, iii, iv, tends at least to show that these elegies were not by the author of the first Lamentation; while the peculiarities in respect of both contents and form which have also been pointed out in reference to the fifth Lamentation, point to an author different from that of the other Lamentations.

"On the whole, the balance of internal evidence may be said to preponderate against Jeremias' authorship of the book. The case is one in which the *differences* have greater weight than the resemblances. Even though the poems be not the work of Jeremias, there is no question that they are the work of a contemporary (or contemporaries);[2] and the resemblances, even including those of phraseology, are not greater than may be reasonably accounted for by the similarity of historical situation. Many, in the same troublous times, must have been moved by the experience of national calamities, as Jeremias was moved by their prospect; and a disciple of Jeremias, or one acquainted with his writings, who, while in adopting in some particulars the standpoint of his nation, agreed in other respects with the prophet, might very naturally interweave his own thoughts with reminiscences of Jeremias' prophecies."[3]

[1] B. Netteler, Gliederung des B. Jeremias, p. 132.

[2] Some of the intrinsic arguments brought forth against the Jeremian authorship go far toward making it probable that the five Lamentations are not by one and the same author.

[3] Driver, loc. cit., p. 464.

Digitized by Google

§ 3. *The Prophecy of Baruch.*[1]

1. **Contents of the Book.** While the division of the Lamentations into five sections is manifest because naturally indicated by the five elegies of which the book is made up, the division of the Prophecy of Baruch into its leading parts cannot be made out with anything like certainty. There are indeed convincing proofs that the sixth chapter of Baruch in the Vulgate, which bears the special title of an "Epistle of Jeremias," is truly distinct from the rest of the work: not only its title, but its style and contents, make it evident that it is a production wholly independent of the book of Baruch proper; and while some MSS. that have Baruch have not the Epistle, others, among the best, have it immediately after Lamentations. But no clear grounds for pointing out the real divisions of the book proper can be appealed to. The following, however, are the more probable divisions of the contents of Baruch i–v.

The book opens with a Historical Introduction (i, 1–14). made up, first, of a statement (verses 1–2) to the effect that the prophecy which follows was written by Baruch at Babylon in the fifth year, at the time when Jerusalem was burned by the Chaldæans; and next, of an apparent digression narrating that the book was read in an assembly of King Jechonias and the leading Babylonian exiles, and produced upon them the most beneficial effects (verses 3–14).

The first section (i, 15–iii, 8) contains a confession of the sins which led to the Captivity, together with a prayer that God will at length pardon His people. This section may be subdivided into two parts, which both open with these words of the book of Daniel: "To Yahweh our God

[1] This book, it will be remembered, is one of the deutero-canonical writings of the Old Testament.

Digitized by Google

belongeth righteousness, but to us confusion of our face, as at this day."[1] The first part (i, 15–ii, 5) reads like a form of confession of sin used by the Jews who had been left in Palestine. "Its restricted design for the use of the home remnant is intimated in the non-occurrence of the words of Daniel, 'and to all Israel that are near and that are afar off,' etc.; as well as by the words of Baruch ii, 4, 5, 'He hath given *them* to be in subjection to all the kingdoms that are round about *us* . . . where Yahweh has scattered *them*: and *they* have become beneath and not above, because *we* sinned.' The confession of sin is national, embracing the whole period from the Exodus, and recognizing in the Exile the righteous fulfilment of repeated warnings."[2] The second part (ii, 6–iii, 8) is also a confession of sins, but is apparently meant for the Jews who had been carried away from Palestine. After repeating practically the same phrases as in i, 15–ii, 5, though in a somewhat different order, the persons here intended are made to say in ii, 13 "*We* are left a few among the nations where Thou hast scattered *us*" (in direct contrast to ii, 4, "Yahweh has scattered *them*"), and in ii, 14, "Grant that *we* may find favor in the sight of those who have led *us* captive" (see also verses 29, 30), while their actual condition is described as that of exiles (ii, 7, 15; iii, 19),[3] punished for not having hearkened to the warnings of Jeremias that they should not resist the king of Babylon. The prayer for forgiveness extends from ii, 14 to iii, 8.

The second section (iii, 9–iv, 4) is a poetical panegyric on Wisdom, which resembles in many ways passages in

[1] Dan. ix, 7.

[2] J. T. MARSHALL, art. Baruch, book of, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 251.

[3] "The divine threat realized in *their* experience is captivity (ii, 7, 15), whereas in the first confession it was that they had eaten the flesh of their children (ii, 1-3)" (J. T. MARSHALL, loc. cit.)

Digitized by Google

chaps. xxviii and xxxviii of the book of Job. The exiles are bidden to come back to the fountain of Wisdom, which they have forsaken; to abide by the Law, which is the embodiment of Wisdom, and which has been given to the Chosen People that they might walk in its light.

The third section (iv, 5–v), poetical like the foregoing, has for its general object to comfort the exiles with the hope of a return and of a glorious future. It is made up of four odes, each commencing with the expression, "Be of good courage" (iv, 5; 21; 27; 30), and of a Psalm closely related to the eleventh of the Psalms of Solomon (iv, 36–v).

The sixth chapter of Baruch, as already stated, does not belong to the book proper. According to its title (verse 1), it is a letter that Jeremias sent, on the divine command, to the Jews soon to be removed by Nabuchodonosor to Babylon. For their sins they were to be exiled and to remain in the heathen city "even to seven generations." There they would see the worship paid to idols of wood, silver, and gold, but should not conform to it. All such idols are powerless and perishable works of man's hand, and can do neither harm nor good; they are not gods at all. This last thought is ten times repeated at the close of as many sections.[1]

2. Original Language and Unity of Composition. Many reasons tend to prove that—as is generally admitted by contemporary critics—the last chapter of the book of Baruch in the Vulgate was originally written, not in Hebrew, as its ascription to Jeremias might lead us to suppose, but in Greek. "Not only there are no observable traces of any original Hebrew text, but even the method of reasoning manifests Grecian learning and a Grecian Jew or Hel-

[1] For a detailed analysis of Baruch vi, see J. T. MARSHALL, art. Jeremy, Epistle of, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 578.

Digitized by Google

lenistic author."[1] So that St. Jerome was decidedly correct when he called this writing ψευδεπίγραφος, for it is manifest that Jeremias would not have composed it in Greek.

As regards the book of Baruch proper, the tendency among recent critics is to consider its first part (i–iii, 8) as the only one primitively written in Hebrew.[2] And yet it can hardly be doubted that the remainder of the book (iii, 9–v) was also originally composed in Hebrew or in Aramaic, as Jahn,[3] Ewald, De Wette, Samuel Davidson, Reusch, Bp. Hanneberg, Kneucker, and many others have admitted. It can be shown, for instance, "that iii, 9–iv, 4 was first composed in Aramaic by a comparison of the Greek text we now possess with the Peshitto and Syriac Hexaplar Versions. When the various readings are translated into Aramaic, we obtain either one Aramaic word with the two desiderated meanings, or two words so nearly alike as easily to be mistaken for one another."[4] But, more particularly, the parallelism of members which is so striking throughout that section goes far toward proving that it was not originally written in Greek. This great characteristic of Semitic poetry is likewise recognizable in iv, 4–v, and this is why it is divided into parallel lines by E. C. Bissell[5] in the same manner as the foregoing poetical section. It must be granted, however, that in iv, 4–v, more than anywhere else, the present Greek text reflects less distinctly a Hebrew original and reads more like a free and paraphrastic rendering thereof.[6] Finally, the view that the whole book of

[1] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 503 (Engl. Transl.). See also J. T. MARSHALL, loc. cit; etc.

[2] For proofs that Baruch i–iii, 8 was composed in Hebrew, see Samuel DAVIDSON Introd. to Old Test., vol. iii, p. 426 sq.; J. T. MARSHALL, Baruch, book of, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 252; etc.

[3] JAHN regards this view simply as more probable.

[4] J. T. MARSHALL, loc. cit., p. 253.

[5] The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, in SCHAFF-LANGE, Comm. on the Holy Scriptures, p. 430 sq.

[6] Cfr. Samuel DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 427.

Digitized by Google

Baruch proper, and not simply i–iii, 8, was originally written in Hebrew seems to harmonize best with the statement in i, 14 to the effect that the *book* was to be read publicly in Temple services:[1] no other but a Hebrew composition could be thought of for so sacred a purpose.

Besides this unity as regards the original language, the book of Baruch presents a certain unity in point of general contents. Its first section (i, 15–ii, 8) contains topics most intimately bound together, viz., a twofold confession of the sins which led to the Exile, and a prayer for forgiveness. The second section (iii, 9–iv, 4) bids the exiles to come back to faithfulness to the Law of Yahweh, so as to secure the hope of the return and the glorious future, the comforting assurance of which is given them in the third section (iv, 5–v). To this trilogy a historical introduction explaining the origin and purpose of the book is naturally prefixed. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that most of those who regard the whole book as originally written in Hebrew admit also its unity of composition. It is true, however, that, despite this general unity of language and subject-matter, the book of Baruch bears the unmistakable impress of the compilatory process whereby its various parts were brought together. The difference in literary form between i–iii, 8 on the one hand and iii, 9–v on the other is manifest to every attentive reader of the Greek text,[2] and, taken together with the abrupt manner in which the panegyric on Wisdom is introduced at iii, 9, suggests a difference with respect to origin. The two confessions of sin embodied in i, 15–iii, 8 are simply put side by side without any natural transition between them at ii, 5. The second and third sections of the book (iii, 9–iv, 4; iv, 5–v)

[1] The opponents of that view take the expression "the book" simply to refer to the confessions of sin in i, 15–ii, 5; ii, 6–iii, 8.

[2] Of the style of these two parts CORNELY, S.J. (Introd. Specialis, vol. ii, part ii, p. 418), says: "Utriusque partis forma omnino differt."

Digitized by Google

are indeed both poetical, but the literary differences between them are very great, and the beginning of the third section at iv, 5 is no less abrupt than that of the second at iii, 9. In like manner the historical introduction, when closely examined, seems to many to have been composed primitively as a preface to only i, 15–ii, 5, all the more so "because the historical situation described in the narrative (i, 3–14) does not agree very well with the subsequent portion, since the narrative assumes the continued existence of the Temple, whereas ii, 26 implies its destruction."[1] Finally, "after the heading of chap. i, 'These are the words of the book which Baruch wrote,' etc., we might expect the book itself to follow immediately, but instead of this we have a long account of the effect produced upon the people by the reading of the book."[2] In view of these and other such facts, it is only natural to admit, with Rausch, Bp. Hanneberg,[3] and most contemporary critics, that the book of Baruch is the outcome of a compilatory process. The final editor put together the various documents which apparently bore upon the Exile, and, if he was not the prophet Baruch himself, ascribed them to that secretary of Jeremias, with a view to secure for his work a greater authority.

3. Authorship and Date. The compilation theory just advocated in regard to the literary method of composision of the book of Baruch does not necessarily do away with the genuineness of that deutero-canonical writing. Many of the sacred writers of the Old Testament were compilers, and Baruch may, and, according to the Catholic

[1] A. A. Bevan, art Baruch, book of, in Cheyne, Encyclop. Biblica, vol i, col. 493.

[2] Ibid., col. 492.

[3] It is only by appealing to a compilatory process that Bp. Hanneberg sees his way through the apparent contradiction between i, 10 sqq., and ii, 5 sqq.; the documents were written at different periods, the one *before*, the other *after* the destruction of Jerusalem. Cfr. Hanneberg, Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, p. 432, footn. 3 (French Transl.).

Digitized by Google

scholars who admit the compilatory character of the book that bears his name, must, be reckoned among them. The book is ascribed to Baruch by its title, has always been regarded as his work by tradition, and its contents present nothing that would be posterior to Baruch's time, or that should be considered as foreign to the style and manner of such a faithful disciple and amanuensis of Jeremias.[1]

In opposition to these grounds which Catholic scholars generally and a very few Protestant writers regard as valid, it is very commonly claimed in the present day that the title of the prophecy of Baruch, on which the tradition in favor of the genuineness rests ultimately, does not appear reliable when confronted with the contents of the book. "Jeremias' faithful friend is said to have composed the work at Babylon. But this view is untenable on the following grounds:

"1. The book contains historical inaccuracies. Jeremias was living in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, yet the prophecy is dated that year at Babylon. It is unlikely that Baruch left Jeremias,[2] since the two friends were so united. According to Baruch i, 3, Jechonias was present in the great assembly before which the book was read, whereas we learn from IV Kings xxv, 27 that he was kept a prisoner as long as Nabuchodonosor lived. Joakim is supposed to be high priest at Jerusalem (i, 7). But we learn from I Paralip. vi, 15 that Josedec filled that office the fifth year after Jerusalem was destroyed. In Baruch i, 2 there is an error. The city was not burned when Joakim was carried away. And if the allusion be to the destruction of the city by Nabuchodonosor, the Temple and its worship are supposed still to exist

[1] For details, cfr. E. PHILIPPE, art. Baruch, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 477; CORNELY; TROCHON; KNABENBAUER; etc.

[2] Baruch and Jeremias had been carried together to Egypt by the Jews who took refuge in that country after the ruin of Jerusalem and the Temple.

Digitized by Google

in i, 8–10. The particulars narrated are put into the fifth year of the Exile, yet we read: 'Thou art waxen old in a strange country' (iii, 10).

"2. Supposing Baruch himself to have been the writer, books later than his time are used in the work. Nehemias is followed as in ii, 11 (comp. Nehem. ix, 10)."[1] "Baruch has correspondences with Daniel which make the employment of the latter by the author of Baruch indubitable. Especially is there an almost verbal agreement between Dan. ix, 7–10 and Baruch i, 15–18. The juxtaposition, too, of Nabuchodonosor and Baltassar is common to both books (Dan. v, 2 sqq. = Baruch i, 11, 12). That so thoroughly original and creative a mind, however, as the author of the book of Daniel should have copied from the book of Baruch is certainly not to be admitted."[2]

Having thus shown to their own satisfaction the unreliable character of the tradition which ascribes the work to Baruch, the opponents of the genuineness proceed to guess at the date to which its composition could be referred. And here they are hopelessly at variance between the two extreme limits of the fourth century B.C. on the one hand and the period after 70 A.D., several among them ascribing different dates to the different parts of the book.[3] A date posterior to the beginning of the Christian era is certainly inadmissible, as is well shown by E. C. Bissell,[4] and the alleged dependence of Baruch on a writer who lived after that disciple of Jeremias can hardly be affirmed "without

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, Baruch, in Encyclop. Britannica, 9th edit.

[2] E. SCHÜRER, a History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, 2d Division, vol. iii, p. 191 (Engl. Transl., New York, 1891). The numerous parallels between Daniel ix 4–19 and Baruch i, 15-ii, 19 are carefully given by DRIVER, Daniel, in the Cambridge Bible, p. lxxiv sq.

[3] For their various views, see E. PHILIPPE, loc. cit., col. 1478; J. T. MARSHALL; SCHÜRER; etc.

[4] Loc. cit., p. 418.

Digitized by Google

assuming the question in dispute, which is the older and which is the text that contains reminiscences of the other. The prayer in Baruch (i, 15–ii, 19) might, no doubt, be an expansion (with at the same time some omissions) of that in Daniel, but the prayer in Daniel might also be an abridgment and adaptation of that in Baruch, or both might also be based upon an ancient traditional form of confession, preserved in its most original form in Daniel."[1] As regards the objections drawn from historical inaccuracies, which are urgent against the genuineness of the book of Baruch, they have met with answers on the part of such able writers as Welte, Reusch, Cornely, Knabenbauer, Trochon, Philippe, and others. These answers are considered as sufficient by Catholic scholars generally. But should any one deem them inadequate, and on that account hold that the book of Baruch is the work of a later editor, the inspired character of the book would subsist, provided this later editor himself be regarded as inspired in his work of compilation.[2] The historical inaccuracies could be simply traced back to the original documents utilized by the inspired editor, for, according to a very recent writer: "The fact that a discourse or a document is embodied in Holy Writ does not *ipso facto* give a new value to that discourse or that document"; and again: "Nothing prevents, at least in theory, an inspired author from borrowing from a profane historian the narrative of facts which will be used as an outward framework to his teaching, without guaranteeing the full and entire authenticity of all those facts."[3]

[1] DRIVER, Daniel, p. lxxv.

[2] Cfr. Card. NEWMAN, art. on the Inspiration of Scripture, in the Nineteenth Century, Feb. 1884, p. 195.

[3] Father PRAT, S.J., in "Les Etudes" for Feb. 20, 1901, pp. 479, 485.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XIII.

THE BOOK OF EZECHIEL.

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS:

- Name and Personal History of the Prophet Ezechiel.
- General Condition of the Jews during Ezechiel's Lifetime.

II. THE BOOK OF EZECHIEL:

1. General Contents:
   - 1st Part: The Approaching Fall of Jerusalem (i–xxiv).
   - 2d Part: Oracles against Foreign Nations (xxv–xxxii).
   - 3d Part: Israel's Future Restoration (xxxiii–xlviii).
2. Condition of Hebrew Text:
   - Confessedly very Defective.
   - Comparison with the Septuagint Version.
3. Characteristics of Style and Language.
4. Authorship and Date:
   - The Ascription to Ezechiel generally Accepted.
   - The Book not finished before 572 B.C.
5. Manner in which it Originated:
   - Principal Collections gathered at different Times.
   - Final Revision of the Whole Work.
6. Literary and Religious Influence in Israel.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XIII.

THE BOOK OF EZECHIEL.

§ 1. *Preliminary Remarks.*

1. Name and Personal History of the Prophet Ezechiel. The prophet whose work stands third, both among the "Later Prophets" in the Hebrew Bible and among the "Greater Prophets" in the Septuagint and Christian Versions generally, is Ezechiel. His name—which, it has been surmised, was given to the prophet after the beginning of his public career—means "El (God) is strong," or, more probably, "El makes strong." He was the son of Buzi, a priest, probably of the line of Sadoc, "which, toward the close of the seventh century, was on the point of getting complete control of the worship of Yahweh in Palestine."[1] The date of his birth may be approximately given as the year 625 B.C., for the fact that he was called to the prophetical office in the fifth year of King Joachin's captivity,[2] "together with the authority with which he speaks and the deference shown him, suggests that he was no longer in his first youth, and this view is confirmed by his familiarity with priestly ritual, probably acquired as an officiating priest at the Temple."[3] Before he was carried into exile with Joachin and the leading Jews of Jerusalem he had ample opportunity to become acquainted with

[1] Prof. Toy, art. Ezekiel, in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 1457.

[2] Joachin's captivity began in 597 B.C. The epoch from which the "thirtieth year" in Ezech. i, 1 is dated is uncertain. Probably the primitive figure in verse 1 was *five* (instead of *thirty*), which is still found in verse 2.

[3] W. H. Bennett, a Biblical Introduction, p. 213.

Digitized by Google

Jeremias, and his book bespeaks great familiarity and sympathy with the teaching of that prophet.

In Babylonia he lived in a community of fellow exiles at Tel-Abib,[1] by the river Chobar, a place no better identified than the river itself.[2] His first prophetical utterances announced the coming ruin of the Holy City, and on that account were very unwelcome to the Jewish captives. The death of his wife occurred about the beginning of the last siege of Jerusalem by Nabuchodonosor (Ezech. xxiv, 16–18), and was soon followed by the destruction of that city and its Temple. It may well be supposed that the fall of Jerusalem which fulfilled the earlier predictions of Ezechiel added considerably to his authority as a prophet; and further, his message henceforth was a happier, and in so far a more welcome, one than in the past: he foretold the coming restoration of the Jewish people. Toward the end of his prophetical activity, with a view no doubt to strengthen the faith of the Jews in a future restoration, he wrote down in detail specifications for a new Temple, rules for its services, and a constitution for the commonwealth. The exact date of his death is unknown.

2. General Condition of the Jews during Ezechiel's Lifetime. Ezechiel's life and prophetical ministry fall approximately within the period 625–565 B.C., that is within a period most important, but also most trying for the Jewish theocracy. The first years were marked by the solemn promulgation of the Deuteronomic Law by King Josias (622 B.C.), and by a renewed covenant between Yahweh and His people. This was a time of triumph for the faithful worshippers of Yahweh, for Jeremias and his devoted friends among the nobles, priests, and prophets. But the triumph was short-lived. The sudden death of the pious

[1] This proper name is rendered by "the heap of new corn" in the Vulgate (iii, 15).

[2] Cfr. Toy, Ezekiel (Polychrome Bible), p. 93 sq.; E. Philippe, art. Ezechiel, in Vigouroux, Dict. de la Bible, col. 2149; etc.

Digitized by Google

Josias on the battle-field of Mageddo (609 B.C.) was a terrible blow to the reforms but lately started in Juda. The heathenizing party pointed out how this national disaster belied the promises of Deuteronomy in favor of men faithful to Yahweh; and the Jewish monarch, Joakim, supported by his authority the reaction from the Deuteronomic legislation, unmindful of the strenuous and persistent opposition of Jeremias and his friends, unmindful also of the calamities which then befell the Jewish state, in the shape of repeated Babylonian invasions. It was, however, only under his successors, Joachin and Sedecias, that the heaviest judgments fell on Juda. Under the former prince Jerusalem was taken, and the Jewish king carried to Babylon together with a very large number of captives belonging to the leading classes (597 B.C.). Ezechiel, as was stated above, was among the captives removed at this time, and his special message to them, when called to the prophetical office five years later, was first to do away with the delusive hope prevalent among them and carefully kept up by the false prophets, that they would be speedily restored to their country and station in life; and next, to prepare them for the most appalling calamity that could overtake the Jewish nation, viz., the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple. Settled apparently in diverse little colonies, these exiles formed small communities by themselves, enjoying a kind of municipal self-government, with elders of their own. Willingly these consulted with Ezechiel, the priest and prophet of Yahweh, on various matters;[1] but his message of woe kept him so much in opposition to the general social and religious feeling of the community among which he lived that he could not hope to exercise any deep or lasting influence upon them.[2]

[1] Cfr. Ezech. viii, 1; xiv. 1; xx, 1.
[2] Cfr. Ezech. ii, 3, 4; iii, 5-7; xx, 49.

Digitized by Google

A few years went by, and Ezechiel's awful predictions proved true. Under Sedecias, Joachin's successor, Nabuchodonosor besieged and took Jerusalem, set on fire the Temple of Yahweh, the palace of the king, and the houses of the wealthy, put to death the chief priests, and carried most of the inhabitants with their monarch into captivity (586 B.C.). A calamity so crushing, and also—despite Ezechiel's distinct and repeated predictions of it—so unexpected, to the Jews already in exile was indeed calculated to cast them into the utmost despair. On the other hand, the very fulfilment of Ezechiel's prophetical words proved a providential means to counteract such feelings of depression. It led to a fuller recognition of his authority, and thereby secured a hearing for his new message of comforting hope in Israel's return and glorious future. Exiles flocked to listen to him, fully convinced that he was Yahweh's mouthpiece, though unwilling to carry his counsels into practice.[1] They heard his warnings against idolatry, but only a few hearkened to them.[2] They were often told of the intimate union which Yahweh would have with renewed Israel, as also of the manner in which each one desirous to be a member of the restored people had to prepare for this invaluable privilege;[3] but most of them became gradually used to their surroundings, shared actively in the industrial and commercial life of their conquerors, and cared but little for the desolate land of Palestine. At no time, however, did the prophet relax his efforts "to win at least the souls of individuals who might form the nucleus of the purified Israel of the future."[4]

[1] Cfr. Ezech. xxxiii, 30–33.

[2] Cfr. Ezech. xiv, 1–11; xvi; xxxiii, 6 sqq.

[3] Cfr. Ezech. xviii; xxxiii, 6–20; xxxvi; xxxix, 25–29.

[4] DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of Old Test, p. 279. For further details concerning the condition of the exiles in Babylon, see "Outlines of Jewish History," p. 304 sqq., by the present writer.

Digitized by Google

§ 2. *The Book of Ezechiel.*

I. General Contents. The book of Ezechiel naturally falls into three parts. The first part (i–xxiv) embraces about half of the work, and consists mainly of prophecies of judgment, foretelling the approaching fall of Jerusalem. It opens with a section (i–iii) called by the Jews "The Vision of the Chariot," and describing the ecstatic experiences by which the prophet was prepared for his work. After contemplating a mysterious chariot and the glory of Him who sat on it, Ezechiel receives a roll written within and without with lamentations, and is commanded to eat it, in token of the revelations which were to be communicated to him. He is called upon, in a second vision, to be a watchman to see and announce the coming events.[1] In the following section (iv–vii) the prophet represents dramatically, in a series of symbols, the siege of Jerusalem, the famine, and the destruction or dispersion of the Jews, and then denounces openly the fate of the city and nation in three impassioned discourses addressed to the City, the Land, and the People, respectively. The third section (viii–xi), dated the sixth year of the exile of Joachin (591 B.C.), is "a theophanic vision the object of which is to set forth clearly the fact that Jahweh no longer dwelt in His temple at Jerusalem, but had withdrawn Himself so that it might be given over to destruction."[2] Transported by the Spirit to Jerusalem and its temple, the prophet sees the different forms of idolatrous worship carried on in the precincts of the temple; witnesses, in symbols, the massacre of the people, and the burning of the City, but receives the comforting assurance that the "remnant of Israel" will be ultimately restored to Sion, from which Yahweh now goes

[1] Cfr. JAHN. Introd. to the Old Test., p. 395 (Engl. Transl.).
[2] Prof. TOY, art. Ezekiel (book), in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 1463.

Digitized by Google

forth by the eastern gate. The fourth section (xii–xxiv) resumes the minatory predictions of chaps. iv–vii. Its general theme is the certainty of the coming of the fall of Jeursalem on account of the nation's sinfulness. She will be destroyed despite the announcements of false prophets to the contrary (xiii). And how could it be otherwise? She contains now only the dregs of the people (xiv), is a half-burnt vine-branch (xv), and an adulteress more sinful than Samaria and Sodom (xvi), and her king, Sedecias, has just foolishly rebelled against his Babylonian masters (xvii). Not indeed that Jerusalem is to be destroyed forever, and the Davidic kingdom not to be set up again, but the guilty ones must be punished (xviii), even though these be Juda and her princes, Joakim and Joachin (xix). After this "comes a remarkable review of the national history (xx), the prophet making the charge that from the beginning Israel had been rebellious. As the end approaches, his words become fiercer: a prediction of the desolation of Juda and Jerusalem, a dithyrambic of the avenging sword, a description of the march of the king of Babylon to Jerusalem, and the overthrow of Sedecias, with an appended prediction of the destruction of the Ammonites who had gloried over Israel (xxi), and a detailed indictment of Jerusalem for her moral and religious crimes (xxii), the ethical and the ritual being curiously mingled. A second elaborate allegory (xxiii) describes the religious debauchery of Samaria and Jerusalem; the careers of the two cities are represented as parallel, only Jerusalem is said to have excelled her sister in evil. . . . Finally, he announces (xxiv) that the king of Babylon has begun the siege of Jerusalem, and sings a song of vengeance on the city; at this juncture his wife dies, and he is commanded, as a sign, to make no mourning for her—so shall the people's terrible punishment crush them into deadness of feeling."[1]

[1] Prof. Toy, loc. cit., col. 1464.

Digitized by Google

The second part (xxv–xxxii) is made up of the Prophecies against the Foreign Nations lying immediately around the Land of Promise, viz.: 1. Ammon; 2. Moab; 3. Edom; 4. The Philistines (xxv); 5. Tyre; 6. Sidon (xxvi–xxviii);[1] 7. Egypt (xxix–xxxii). "The insertion of these oracles in this place is an instance of the constructive skill which planned the order of the book. They fill up the interval of silence which separates the two periods of Ezechiel's ministry. . . . The section, moreover, embodies a distinct idea in the prophet's eschatological scheme. The motive of the judgments announced is to prepare the way for the restoration of Israel, by removing the evil influences which had sprung from the people's contact with its heathen neighbors in the past (xxviii, 24–26; xxix, 16). Historically, these judgments are conceived as taking place within the forty years of the Chaldæan dominion (xxix, 13) and of Israel's banishment."[2]

The third part (xxxiii–xlviii) has for its general theme the future Restoration of Israel, and on this account forms a natural counterpart to the first great division of the book (i–xxiv). Like that first part, it opens with the intrusting to Ezechiel of the spiritual watchman's mission to give due signal that each one who so chooses may be saved from his iniquity (xxxiii, 1–20).[3] The prophet denounces, therefore, the remnant of Juda for their immorality, and the exiles for their unwillingness to act according to his warnings (xxxiii, 21–33). Having thus discharged what he considered a preliminary duty, Ezechiel proceeds to describe in a first section (xxxiv–xxxix) the manner in which God will restore His people to the land of promise. Yahweh Himself, now in Babylon, will take the worthy ones back to Chanaan, from

1 F[illegible] an interpolation which interrupts the description of [illegible]

[illegible] in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 818.

[illegible]-21, and xviii.

Digitized by Google

which He will expel the Edomites and other intruders. For His name's sake He will make the land populous and fertile, and bestow upon His people a new heart and a new spirit. The nation will revive and be made up of both Juda and Ephraim under the headship of a prince of David's descent. In vain will foreign hordes endeavor to destroy Israel, they will be reduced to naught; Yahweh's name will be vindicated before all nations, and "He will hide His face no more from them, for He has poured out His spirit upon the house of Israel, saith Adonai Yahweh."[1] The second section (xl–xlviii) is "a vision of the ideal theocracy, with the institutions by which the holiness of the redeemed people is to be expressed and maintained. There is, first, a description of the sanctuary where Yahweh is to dwell in visible splendor (xl–xliii); then, regulations as to the ministers of the temple, the duties and revenues of the priests and 'the prince,' and the system of ritual to be observed (xliv–xlvi); lastly, a delimitation of the Holy Land—which is transformed by a miraculous river issuing from the sanctuary—and a new disposition of the tribes (xlvii–xlviii)."[2]

2. Condition of the Hebrew Text. The Massoretic Text of the book of Ezekiel is confessedly very incorrect. Textual critics have pointed out all manners of various readings in the Hebrew MSS., although scarcely any of these variations render the meaning of the text really doubtful. Thus, according to C. H. Cornill,[3] between the Textus Receptus and the oldest Hebrew Codex there are only sixteen important variations, viz.: iii, 22; vi, 5; viii, 1; xi, 19; xii, 25; xiii, 20; xvi, 50; xxiii, 19; xxv, 5; xxvi, 14; xxvi, 20; xxviii, 26; xxxii, 23; xxxii, 30; xxxiii, 23; xlvii, 9. But besides the variations which are disclosed by

[1] Ezech. xxxix. 29

[2] Prof. SKINNER, loc. cit.

[3] Das Buch des Proph. Ez, Prolegomena, p. 9.

Digitized by Google

a collation of the Hebrew MSS., many alterations, and indeed of a more serious character, can be made out by means of other critical tests. The context of a passage, the sense clearly unsatisfactory which it now yields, its comparison with the ancient Versions, etc., show that, time and again, the primitive wording has been interfered with. It is plain, for instance, that in chap. x several insertions of various kinds have crept into the Hebrew, to the detriment of either the sequence of ideas or the perspicuity of the text; again, the text of the dithyrambic ode in xxi, 8–17 (Heb. xxi, 13–22), and of the description of the Temple in xli–xlii, 12, is decidedly, and to all appearances, irretrievably corrupt.[1] In like manner the context suggests that xxvii, 9[b]–25[a] and many shorter passages in Ezechiel should be considered as later insertions. But it is more particularly the comparison of the Hebrew Text with the ancient Versions, especially the Septuagint, which discloses many, and at times important, subsequent changes in the line of additions, omissions, etc. Indeed, were we to trust Cornill's verdict concerning the value of the Septuagint translation, we should admit that that Version is "absolutely reliable," and may be taken as a sure basis for the reconstruction of the original Hebrew. In reality, even the Vaticanus Codex, which is regarded as giving the best-preserved text of the Septuagint, has, in common with our Hebrew Textus Receptus, many readings traceable to the carelessness, ignorance, etc., of the transcribers. It is beyond question, however, that the Septuagint Version of the book of Ezechiel is our best means for testing the Massoretic Text, and very often supplies readings which, because of the context, must be considered as primitive.[2]

[1] Cfr. Prof. Toy, the Book of Ezekiel (Engl. Transl.), in the Polychrome Bible, notes, pp. 114 sq., 137, 177 sqq., and E. Philippe, art. Ezéchiel le livre d'), in Vigouroux, Dict. de la Bible, col. 2158; etc.

[2] For examples, cfr., besides Toy, loc. cit., Samuel Davidson, the Hebrew Text

Digitized by Google

2. Characteristics of Style and Language. The defective condition of the text just spoken of accounts probably for much of the obscurity with which the style of Ezechiel has been often charged in past centuries. This will appear all the more admissible because Ezechiel's prophecies display much less spontaneity in respect of both matter and form than those of the other prophets. They evince more the reflection and study of leisurely composition, and the allegories and long descriptive passages therein found are as a rule skilfully and lucidly disposed, so that when his hearers said of him: "Aḥ, Adonai Yahweh! Does not this man speak by parables?"[1] it was not because they had grown tired of his elaborate and intricate symbols,[2] but because, obstinately sceptical as to the fate of the Holy City, they were unwilling to take literally his words concerning it. Of course a certain difficulty of interpretation attaches to a book replete with symbols, allegories, and parables, but this is due to the kind itself of composition much more than to the style of the writer who had recourse to it in order to suggest truths unwelcome to his hearers. Indeed it is highly probable that the ancient Jewish rabbis, whose complaints regarding the prophet's obscurity are reechoed by St. Jerome, would not have found so much fault with his work had they not thought that Ezechiel went at times against statements embodied in the Law of Moses.[3]

The literary style of Ezechiel is strongly marked not only by its constant use of symbols, allegories, and parables, but also by its large number of peculiar words and stereotyped expressions. Among the oft-repeated expressions

(London, Bagster), p. 110 sqq.; CORNILL, loc. cit.; KNABENBAUER, S.J., in Ezechielem prophetam; etc.

[1] Ezech. xx, 49.

[2] As is supposed by W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introd., p. 215.

[3] Cfr. G. WILDEBOER, Origin of the Canon of the Old Test., p. 67 sqq. (Engl. Transl.); TROCHON, Ezekiel, in LETHIELLEUX' Bible, p. 9; etc.

Digitized by Google

characteristic of that prophet, the following are pointed out by Prof. Driver:

1. *Ben 'adam* (Son of man) in addressing the prophet: $2^{1.3}$, $3^{1.3.4}$, and constantly (nearly 100 times); often in the phrase, *And thou, son of man:* $2^{6.8}$, 3^{25}, 4^{1}, 5^{1}, etc. Elsewhere (as a title) only Dan. 8^{17}.
2. *Adonai Yahweh:* 2^{4}, $3^{11.27}$, etc. (more than 200 times altogether. In other prophets occasionally, but far less frequently: e.g. about 14 times in Jer.).
3. *Beth Me'ri* (House of rebelliousness) of Israel: $2^{5.6.8}$, $3^{9.26.27}$, $12^{2.3.9.25}$, 17^{12}, 24^{3}; *rebelliousness* alone (LXX *house of*), 2^{7}, 44^{6}. Comp. Nu. 17^{10} [Heb. 16^{35}] P *Bene Me'ri;* Is. 30^{9}.
4. *'Arçoth* (lands): $5^{5.6}$, 6^{8}, and often (in all 27 times). The plur. of this word greatly *preponderates* in later writers: Gen. $10^{5.20.31}$ (P) $26^{3.4}$, (R), 41^{54}, Lev. $26^{36.39}$, (H); then not till II Ki. 18^{35}, 19^{11}; never in other prophets except Jer. 7 times, Dan. 3 times; in Chr. Ezr. Neh. 22 times.
5. *Behold, I am against* . . . usually *thee* or *you:* 5^{8}, $13^{8.20}$, 21^{3}, [Heb.^{8}] 26^{3}, 28^{22}, $29^{3.10}$, 30^{22}, 34^{10}, 35^{3}, 36^{9}, (*toward*,—in a favorable sense) 38^{3}, 39^{1}. So Nah. 2^{14}, 3^{5}, Jer. 21^{13}, $23^{30.31.32}$, 50^{31}, 51^{25}.
6. *To do judgments on;* $5^{10.15}$, 11^{9}, 16^{41}, 25^{11}, $28^{22.26}$, $30^{14.19}$; also Ex. 12^{12}, 33^{4}, (both P), cf. II Ch. 24^{24}, (אח׳: שפמ׳ם also (a rare word) Ez. 14^{21}, Ex. 6^{6} 7^{4} (both P), Pr. 19^{29}.
7. *To scatter to every wind:* $5^{10.12}$, (cf. v.^{2}), 12^{14}, (cf. 17^{21}); Jer. 49^{32}.
8. (*My*) *eye shall not spare* (now followed by *neither will* (*I*) *have pity*): 5^{11}, $7^{4.9}$, 8^{18}, $9^{5.10}$, 16^{5}, 20^{17}.
9. *To satisfy* (lit. *bring to rest*) *my fury upon* . . . : 5^{13}, 16^{42}, 21^{17}, [Heb.^{22}] 24^{13}. Cf. Zach. 6^{8}.
10. *I, Yahweh, have spoken it*, usually as a closing asseveration: 5^{13}, 15^{17}, 17^{21}, $21^{17.32}$, [Heb.$^{22.37}$], 24^{14}, 26^{14}, 30^{12}, 34^{24}; followed by *and have done it* (or *will do it*): 17^{24}, 22^{14}, 36^{6}, 37^{14}. So *I have spoken it:* 23^{34}, 26^{5}, 28^{10}, 39^{5}. Comp. Nu. 14^{35}. Not so in any other prophet.
11. *To finish my fury* (or *wrath*) *upon* . . . : 5^{13b}, 6^{12}, 7^{8}, 13^{15}, $20^{8.21}$; cf. 5^{13a}, (*be finished*). So Lam. 4^{11}.
12. *Set thy face toward* or *against:* 6^{2}, 13^{17}, 20^{46}, 21^{2}, [Heb. $21^{2.7}$], 25^{2} 28^{21}, 29^{2}, 35^{2}, 38^{2}.

[2] Introd. to Literature of Old Test., p. 297 sq.

Digitized by Google

13. *The mountains of Israel:* $6^{2.3}$, 19^{9}, 33^{28}, $34^{13.14}$, 35^{12}, $36^{1bis.4.8}$, 37^{22}, 38^{8}, $39^{2.4.17}$ cf. 34^{14}. A combination peculiar to Ez.

14. *'Aphigim* (watercourses), often joined with *mountains*, *hills*, and *valleys*, as a rhetorical designation of a country: 6^{3}, 31^{12}, 32^{6}, 34^{13}, 35^{8}; $36^{4.6}$.

15. *Gillulim* (idol blocks): $6^{4.5.6.9.13}$, 8^{10}, $14^{3.7}$, 16^{36}, $18^{6.12.15}$, $20^{7.8.16.18}$, and often (39 times).

16. *And . . . shall know that I am Yahweh* (see p. 295). Comp. in P, Ex. 6^{7}, 7^{5}, $14^{4.8}$, 16^{12}, 29^{46}; cf. 31^{13b}, (H). Occasionally besides, Ex. 10^{2}, I Ki. $20^{13.28}$, Is. $49^{23.26}$ 60^{16}, Joel 3^{17}.

17. *To scatter among the lands:* 6^{8}, 12^{15}, 20^{23}, 22^{15}, 29^{12}, $30^{23.26}$, 36^{19}; cf. with *to disperse:* $11^{16.17}$, $20^{34.41}$. Cf. No. 25.

18. *To stretch out my hand upon . . . :* 6^{14}, $14^{9.13}$, 16^{27}, $25^{7.13.16}$, 35^{3}.

19. *To pour out my fury upon . . . :* 7^{8}, 9^{8}, 14^{19}, $20^{8.13.21}$, 22^{22}, 30^{15}, 36^{18}, cf. $20^{33.34}$.

20. *Stumbling-block of iniquity:* 7^{19}, $14^{3.4.7}$, 18^{30}, 44^{12}.

21. *Nasi'* (*ruler* or *prince*) applied sometimes to the king: 7^{27}, $12^{10.12}$, 19^{1}, 21^{12}, (Heb.^{17}) ^{25}, (Heb.^{30}), 22^{6}, 34^{24}, 37^{25}, $45^{8.9}$; and (in the sing.) 44^{3}, $45^{6.16.17.22}$, $46^{2.4.8.10.12.16.18}$, $48^{21.22}$. Not of Israel, 26^{16}, 27^{21}, 30^{13}, 32^{29}, $38^{2.3}$, $39^{1.18}$. This term is used by no other prophet, and is very rare elsewhere, except in P.

22. A subject opened by means of a *question:* $8^{6.12.15.17}$, (so 47^{6}), 12^{22} $15^{2ff.}$, 18^{2}, 19^{2}, $20^{3.4}$, 22^{2}, 23^{36}, $31^{2.18}$, 32^{19}, 37^{3}; cf. $17^{9.10.15}$.

23. *To put a person's way upon his head* (i.e. to requite him): 9^{10}, 11^{21}, 16^{43}, 22^{31}; cf. 17^{19}. Only besides I Ki. 8^{32}, (=II Ch. 6^{23}).

24. אגפים, *wings:* 12^{14}, 17^{21}, 38^{6}, *bis* $^{9.22}$, 39^{4}.

25. *To disperse among the nations:* 12^{15}, 20^{23}, 22^{15}, 29^{12}, $30^{23.26}$, 36^{19}; cf. 28^{25}, 29^{13}. Cf. No. 17.

26. *To bear shame:* 16^{52}, 5^{4}, $32^{24.25.30}$, 34^{29}, $36^{6.7.15}$, 39^{26}, 44^{13}.

27. *Sh'at*, *contempt*, *Shut to contemn* (Aram.): 16^{57}, $25^{6.15}$, $28^{24.26}$, 36^{5}.

28. *To be sanctified* (or *get me holiness*) *in:* 20^{41}, $28^{22.25}$, 36^{23}, 38^{16}, (cf. v.^{23}), 39^{27}; cf. Lev. 10^{3}, 22^{32}, Nu. 20^{13}, (all P). Cf. the stress laid on Yahweh's *holy name*, 20^{39}, 36^{20-22}, $39^{7.25}$, $43^{7.8}$, (cf. 36^{23}; and *for my name's sake*, $20^{9.14.22}$. 4^{4}).

29. *In the time of the iniquity of the end:* $21^{25.29}$, (Heb. $^{30.34}$), 35^{5}.

30. *The fire of my indignation:* 21^{31}, $22^{21.31}$, 38^{19}.*

* For numerous examples of words peculiar to Ezechiel, see KEIL, Introd. to Old Test., vol. i, p. 357 sq. (Engl. Transl.). Keil's list, however, needs sifting.

Digitized by Google

"The constant recurrence of these or other such mannerisms or formulas is oftentimes monotonous, although the lack of variety in this respect is usually redeemed by the great diversity in the form of Ezechiel's presentation: he abounds in vision, parable, and allegory;[1] as also by the multitude of details he spreads out before his readers; and even, at times, by a large rhythmic movement of the thought, running like a ground-swell through some of the longer orations."[2] But throughout the book the parallelism so remarkable in Amos, Isaias, and other prophets anterior to the Exile, because it borders closely on exalted lyric poetry, is really absent. Only occasionally does Ezechiel venture on a poetical strain, and even then his rhythm is almost invariably that, not of lyrical, but of elegiac compositions. His imaginative faculty is indeed of a high order, but it reminds one of the trained amplifying faculty of the rhetor rather than of the soaring imagination of the poet or of the orator. The influence of the Aramaic upon his diction can hardly be questioned in regard to the endings of verbs and nouns, the omission of the article, etc.,[3] and in this respect, too, the style of Ezechiel exhibits a falling off from the general idiomatic purity of the prophetical writers before him.

Ezechiel's literary affinities with the terminology of the Priestly Code, and especially of the Law of Holiness (Levit. xvii–xxvi), are well set forth by DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., pp. 49 sq.; 130 sqq.; 145 sqq.

4. Authorship and Date. The strongly-marked peculiarities of style and language which all scholars recognize throughout the prophecies of Ezechiel are one of the main

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1024, footn. 2.

[2] J. SKINNER, loc. cit., p. 818.

[3] For examples, see Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to Old Test., vol. iii, p. 146. Perhaps many of the Aramaisms of the book may be accounted for by scribal alterations (cfr. TOY, art. Ezekiel, in Encycl. Bibl., vol ii, col. 1459).

Digitized by Google

reasons for which the traditional authorship of the book is well-nigh universally accepted in the present day. They powerfully concur with the manifest homogeneousness of the contents and literary structure of the whole work, to produce the impression upon the mind of the impartial critic that this prophetical writing is not a compilation like those ascribed to Isaias, Jeremias, etc.

While these distinct features point to only one writer as the author of the book of Ezechiel, others hardly less unmistakable show that this sole author was practically contemporary with Jeremias. "The general tone of the book is different from that of the post-exilic prophets, and particularly from that of Daniel—it has nothing in common with them but an incipient apocalypse: Israel is struggling with idolatry, is to be chastised and purified, is in definite relation with certain nations. The religious and political situations are the same in Ezechiel as in Jeremias."[1] Even the ideal constitution of restored Israel which is delineated in chaps. xl–xlviii, and which some critics[2] are still tempted to regard as betraying a date later than the Exile, when closely examined appears to be the work of a priestly prophet living before the Return from Babylon, and such as we know Ezechiel to have been. That he was a priest is obvious from the fact that so much space in these chapters is devoted to the Temple and its services, to its ministers, etc.; so much detailed information respecting the sanctuary, sacrifices, things priestly generally is given therein; and that the whole constitution of Israel is made to hinge on ritual faithfulness. That this priestly writer composed chaps. xl–xlviii before the Return can be inferred from the considerable influence which his work exercised upon the reorganization of the divine worship imme-

[1] Tov, art. Ezechiel (book), in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 1460.
[2] Among them we may mention J. Skinner, loc. cit., p. 818.

Digitized by Google

diately after the Exile.[1] That, finally, this priestly exilic writer was no other than Ezechiel may be said to be confirmed by the contents of the last nine chapters of the book: "The visions, the manner of conveying reproof, the multitude of circumstantial particulars, the character of language and style, in all which respects Ezechiel is remarkably distinguished from other writers, prove that he must have been the author of these chapters. No imitation could possibly have been so successful."[2]

Apart, then, from scribal errors and expansions—which latter indeed are much less extensive in Ezechiel than in other books of the Old Testament, chiefly because it gives a full and cheering picture of the future of the nation[3]—the book of Ezechiel is rightly ascribed to the prophet whose name it bears. The objections urged by a few recent scholars, viz., Geiger, Zunz, Seinecke, Vernes, and Havet, against the authorship, have been sufficiently answered, and there is no probability that at a future time they will be revived with any success.[4] As regards the old Jewish tradition embodied in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, fol. 14[b]) that "the men of the Great Synagogue wrote Ezechiel," it is one out of many proofs that the so-called Jewish traditions regarding the authorship of the sacred writings are anything but reliable.

Although the prophet Ezechiel was, as it seems, careful to prefix dates to the various groups of his predictions,[5] two principal difficulties meet one who wishes to set forth the precise date of composition of the respective groups. First, it can hardly be doubted that sometimes the figures

[1] For important remarks in this connection, see W. R Smith, Old Test. in Jewish Church, 2d edit., p. 442 sqq., loc. cit.; and J. Skinner, loc. cit.

[2] Jahn, Introd. to Old Test, p. 403 (Engl. Transl.).

[3] Toy, Ezechiel, in Polychrome Bible, p. 92.

[4] For brief answers to them, see Toy, Ezechiel (book), in Encyclop. Bibl., vol. ii, col. 1460.

[5] Cfr. i; viii; xx; xxiv; xxix; xxx; xxxii, 1, 17; xxxiii, 21; xl.

Digitized by Google

given in the Massoretic Text are incorrect; and next, it is not sure that the date given at the beginning of a long section reaches to the next mention of date.[1] Kuenen has even supposed that the inscriptions found in the Hebrew Text are merely a setting inserted long afterwards by the prophet. However this may be, it is all but certain that the book of Ezechiel was not completed before the twenty-fifth year of the prophet's captivity (572 B.C): the inscription to the last group of predictions (xl–xlviii) gives that date, and there is no positive reason to call in question the correctness of its statement.

5. **Manner in which the Book Originated.** As "the book of Ezechiel has come down to us substantially as it left his hand,"[2] it is a comparatively easy task to describe the manner in which it originated. Its real lack of spontaneity as a literary production—which is distinctly realized when it is contrasted with the other prophetical writings—produces the impression upon the reader that most if not all its contents were either never delivered orally, or only spoken after they had been carefully prepared in regard to both matter and form. As the prophet was apparently "dumb" for a number of years,[3] he probably simply wrote his prophecies during that time, polishing them up before they were made known to the exiles of Tel-Abib, and thus the habit grew gradually upon him to convey his teachings by means of parables, allegories, etc., prepared in their general outlines, and also in the many details without which they would not have appealed to the imagination of his hearers with anything like the charm

[1] The Massoretic dates in xxxii, 1, 17; xxxiii are probably incorrect (cfr. W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introd., p. 219 sq.), and it may be questioned whether the date given in viii, 1 applies till the next date in xx, 1.

[2] TOY, Ezechiel (Polychrome Bible), p. 92.

[3] Cfr. Ezechiel iii, 26; xxix, 21; xxxiii, 22.

Digitized by Google

with which, as we are informed, they did.[1] In putting together his separate prophecies, Ezechiel followed a definite plan, which is still observable in his work. The various groups of predictions he put under a common date, and all the groups treating of the same general topic he arranged into a definite collection. Thus in the first part of the book (i–xxiv), dealing mainly with the approaching fall of Sion, the various groups are disposed in perfect chronological order, and are brought to a natural conclusion at xxiv, 27. In like manner the second part (xxv–xxxii) or main collection embodied in the book he made to include all the oracles he had directed at different times against the foreign nations. Finally, the two distinct collections which go to make up the last part of his work (xxxiii–xxxix; xl–xlviii) and referring to the same common topic, the future restoration of the Jewish theocracy, were probably formed at first separately (cfr. xxix, 29, which reads as the end of a once distinct collection), but finally united together. In this way did the work gradually grow and assume its present form under Ezechiel's remarkable literary care.

As the book was not written and put into its present form at once, it is highly probable that its systematic and obvious general plan, and more particularly its great uniformity of diction and coloring, points to a final revision of the whole work by the prophet himself. The only plausible objection raised against this important inference is drawn from alleged contradictions in Ezechiel (between xxxix, 17–20 and xxvi, 12; between iii, 26, xxxiii, 22 and xi, 25, xx, 49; xxx, 30), which, it is argued, would not have been allowed to stand by the prophet had he carried out himself a complete final revision of his book. In reality, even taking for granted the existence of the alleged

[1] Cfr. Ezech. xxxiii 30 sqq.

Digitized by Google

discrepancies, there is no proof that Ezechiel must needs have removed them when he finally revised his prophecies.[1]

6. Literary and Religious Influence of the Book of Ezechiel in Israel. As might naturally be expected of a book composed by an influential priest and true prophet of Yahweh, the work of Ezechiel was destined to exercise a considerable literary and religious influence in Israel. Its literary influence is borne out by a close comparison of its text with that of the Priestly Code, and more particularly with that of the Law of Holiness. Of course it would not be correct from the literary resemblances between Ezechiel's work and the Priestly Code, to infer—as is done by some contemporary critics—that Ezechiel is the writer of the Priest's Code, for all such resemblances as really exist should not make us lose sight of important differences which are no less undeniable. But a comparison between the two literary productions proves that they both originated during the Exile, and also that the Priest's Code underwent the influence of the priestly conceptions and expressions of the priestly-prophet, Ezekiel.[2] A wider literary influence may also be ascribed to the book of Ezechiel. As far as can be ascertained, that prophet was the first divine messenger in Israel who, instead of simply recording in writing the prophecies he had already delivered

[1] Of the alleged discrepancies, the one which refers to the taking of Tyre by Nabuchodonosor, which is affirmed in xxvi, 12, and apparently denied in xxix, 17–20, has most perplexed commentators When one bears in mind, on the one hand, the conditional character of prophecy, and, on the other, the fact that this conditional character was well known to the ancient prophets, it does not seem difficult to understand how, even supposing that Ezechiel noticed the alleged discrepancy, he did not feel in duty bound to remove it. (Cfr. History, Prophecy, and the Monuments, by Jas. F. McCurdy, vol iii, p. 392. See also C. Geikie, Hours with the Bible, new edit., vol. vi, p. 180 sq.; Knabenbauer, S.J., in Ezechielem proph.; etc.)

[2] For the literary affinities between Ezechiel and P. C., see Driver, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., pp. 49 sq., 130 sqq., 145 sqq.; R. Kittel, a History of the Hebrews, vol. i, § 9, p. 107 sqq. (Engl. Transl.); Prof. Gray, art. Law Literature, in Cheyne, Encyclop. Biblica, vol. iii, col 2,37 sqq.; etc.

Digitized by Google

orally, wrote most if not all of them carefully before uttering them in public. In so doing he set an important example before Hebrew writers of his time, as also of the subsequent period. The Deutero-Isaias, and the prophetic writers or editors of the historical books, the "Earlier Prophets," as they are called, followed in his train: the former wrote the book of "the Consolation of Israel" (Isai. xl–lxvi) under the form of a direct address to the Jews; the latter inserted in their compilatory works divine oracles, or judgments, which to all appearances were not delivered orally to God's chosen people.

Deeper and more lasting still was the religious influence exercised by Ezechiel. In matters of doctrine he first of all inculcated the great truths taught in common by his predecessors, such as the evil of foreign alliances, the doom of Israel and Juda on account of the vice and cruelty of the governing classes, the future restoration, and the Messias as a Davidic prince. In the second place, he enlarged upon and gave greater currency to the teachings of Jeremias, especially in what concerns "individual religion. His prophetic ministry is partly pastoral, he is a watchman for every single soul. A man is not punished for his father's sin, but each is judged not only according to his own doings, but according to his moral condition at the time of judgment.[1] Ezechiel's teaching as to a new heart and a new spirit (xi, 19) is also an echo of Jeremias' New Covenant."[2] Lastly, he brought out—and this seems to be peculiarly his own contribution to Jewish doctrine and practice—the view that since Yahweh, the supreme master and lord of Israel, is infinitely holy, the land, the people,

[1] It is hardly necessary to remark that the judgment which the prophet has in view is not the *post-mortem* judgment as understood by Christians. There is only question of the ordeal that will determine which among the Babylonian captives are to be found worthy of a place in the "remnant" destined for the reconstruction of Israel.

[2] W. H. Bennett, a Biblical Introduction, p. 222 sqq.

Digitized by Google

the private citizen, the ruler, the priest, etc., belong to Him and should abstain from aught, inwardly and also outwardly, that could defile them. This led him to draw up a Constitution of Restored Israel, which bound up together more intimately than in the past the moral and ritual obligations of the Chosen People, placed more directly the conscience of the individual under the control of the priest, centred more effectively the public worship in the rebuilt Temple, and tended to make of the whole Jewish race the one essentially theocratic people. On many important points—for instance, the sharp distinction between Levites and priests; a great faithfulness to sacrifices, the Sabbath, and religious observances, etc.—Ezechiel's teaching directly influenced the Restoration period, and in this way gradually moulded the chosen people into a nation very different from what it had been before the Babylonian Captivity. On that account, and to that extent, Ezechiel may be called the "Father of Judaism."[1]

[1] Cfr. BENNETT, loc. cit., p. 220 sq.; Jno. SKINNER, art. Ezechiel, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 819; E. KAUTZSCH, an Outline of the History of the Literature of the Old Test., p. 89 sq. (Engl. Transl.); etc.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XIV.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS:

1. Place of this Book in the Canon.
2. Principal Data concerning the Prophet Daniel.
3. Chief Events of Antiochus' Reign connected with the Book of Daniel.

II. THE PROTO-CANONICAL PARTS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL:

1. Contents:
   - 1st Part: A series of Narratives in the third person (i–vi).
   - 2d Part: A series of Visions in the first person (vii–xii).
2. Didactic Purpose and Literary Unity.
3. Authorship and Date:
   - The Traditional View:
     - Precise Statement.
     - Leading Arguments (Extrinsic and Intrinsic).
     - How modified by Souciet, S.J., Jahn, Bp. Hanneberg, Quatremère, etc.
   - The Recent Theory:
     - Statement (Daniel mainly an Apocalypse, belonging as a whole to the time of Antiochus (B.C. 175–164)).
     - Manifold Intrinsic Evidence in its Favor.
     - How far Admissible.

III. THE DEUTERO-CANONICAL PARTS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL:

1. Contents, and Place in the Septuagint, in the Vulgate.
2. Original Language (Greek or Aramaic).
3. Difficulties concerning Authorship.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

§ 1. *Preliminary Remarks.*

1. Place of the Book in the Canon. The book which in the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and most modern Christian Versions of the Old Testament follows immediately the prophecy of Ezechiel is that of Daniel. The position thus ascribed to it is obviously due to the fact that when the sacred writings of the Old Covenant in their Greek garb were arranged in a topical order, the book of Daniel was treated as containing important prophecies, and as such worthy of taking rank side by side with the great prophets Isaias, Jeremias, and Ezechiel. The position then ascribed to it after Ezechiel appeared all the more natural because, though a captive in Babylon at about the same time as that priestly prophet, Daniel, as was gathered from the data of his book, was a younger man, and foretold events much more distant than had been done by Ezechiel.

In our present Hebrew Bibles the book of Daniel is not included in their second great section, that of the *Nᵉbhiim* or "Prophets," but in the third, that of the *Kᵉthubhim* or "Hagiographa," wherein it stands between Esther and Esdras. So far as we know, the Palestinian Canon ever counted Daniel among the *Kᵉthubhim*, although its precise place among them varied at different times.[1]

[1] Cfr. H. E. Ryle, the Canon of the Old Test, p. 280 (Lists of Hebrew Scriptures)

Digitized by Google

2. Principal Data concerning the Prophet Daniel. Concerning the hero and traditional writer of the book of Daniel everything that is known is contained in the book itself. Being of royal, or at least of noble, descent (i, 3), when still a youth he was taken captive to Babylon by Nabuchodonosor, in the fourth year of Joakim (B.C. 605). He was taught the language and learning of the "Chaldæans," with a view to enter the king's service. At Babylon he received the distinctive name of *Baltassar*, and with his three friends Ananias, Misael, and Azarias—who had been surnamed Sidrach, Misach, and Abdenago—observed the Mosaic law as far as circumstances allowed.[1] After three years of instruction he and his companions stood before the king, that is obtained some office at court, and henceforth were found to excel in wisdom "all the diviners and wise men that were in the kingdom."[2] In the course of time—either the second or the twelfth year of Nabuchodonosor[3]—Daniel repeated and interpreted, on the failure of all the other wise men, the king's dream of a colossal statue, which was made up of various materials, and which, struck by a little stone, broke up, while the little stone grew into a mountain and filled the whole earth. Whereupon the monarch made him ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief governor of all the wise men of the realm. Daniel's three friends received some manner of promotion at his request. He also interpreted the king's dream of a mighty tree concerning which Nabuchodonosor heard the command given that it should be cut down, and that "seven times" should "pass over" its stump that had been left standing. Daniel's interpretation that the great king should be deprived of the

[1] In Ezechiel xiv, 14, 18, 20, Daniel is mentioned, apparently because of his piety, together with Noe and Job.

[2] In Ezechiel xxviii, 3, Daniel is spoken of as the wisest of his contemporaries.

[3] Cfr. DRIVER, Daniel (Cambridge Bible), p. 17; TROCHON, Daniel (LETHIELLEUX' Bible), p. 95; etc.

Digitized by Google

use of his reason during seven years proved true; and at the end of that trial Nabuchodonosor issued a proclamation directed to all the world, and whereby he solemnly acknowledged the supreme power and goodness of the Most High God.

After the death of Nabuchodonosor Daniel seems to have lost his high office and lived long in retirement. On the occasion, however, of the handwriting *Mane*, *Thecel*, *Phares*, on the wall of the palace during King Baltassar's feast,[1] he was given an opportunity to exhibit again his sagacity in unlocking hidden things, and on that account became one of the three chief ministers in the kingdom. This dignity was confirmed to him by Darius the Mede after the conquest of Babylon. But through the machinations of his fellow officers he was thrown into the den of lions, because by praying, as was his wont, three times a day to his God he had contravened Darius' decree that for thirty days no one should address a petition either to a god or to a man Through a miraculous intervention, however, he was taken out unhurt, and in consequence the king decreed that all men should dread and fear the God of Daniel. "So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian."

Such are the principal data concerning Daniel which are supplied by the first six chapters of his book. In the next six chapters he appears as the recipient of visions respecting the future of Israel. In the deutero-canonical appendices to the Vulgate—the history of Susanna and the two elders (xiii), and that of Bel and the Dragon (xiv)—Daniel plays also a prominent part. Neither the date of his birth nor that of his death is mentioned in the book that bears his

[1] The date of Baltassar's feast is given as the eve of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus (B.C. 538), that is twenty-three years after the end of Nabuchodonosor's reign. If we suppose that Daniel was 16 or 17 years of age at the beginning of the captivity (B.C. 605), he must have been 83 or 84 years old when summoned to read the handwriting on the wall.

Digitized by Google

name. The Roman martyrology assigns his feast as a holy prophet to July 21st.

3. Chief Events of Antiochus' Reign connected with the Book of Daniel. As all interpreters of Daniel vii–xii agree in connecting many of the events therein referred to with those which occurred under Antiochus IV., the great persecutor of the Jews in the second century before Christ, we subjoin an outline of the leading events of his reign and of the probable references to them in Daniel.[1]

Date.	*Event of Antiochus' Reign.*	*Reference in Daniel.*
B.C. 176.	Accession (cfr. I Mach. i, 10).	Daniel vii, 8, 11, 20; viii, 9, 23; xi, 21.
" 175.	Jason's intrigues against Onias III., and purchase from Antiochus of the High-priesthood. Rise of Hellenizing party in Jerusalem (cfr. I Mach. i, 11–15; II Mach. iv, 7–22).	
" 172.	Onias III. murdered (cfr. II Mach. iv, 32–35).	Dan. ix, 26[a]; xi, 22[b].
" 171.	First expedition of Antiochus against Egypt (cfr. I Mach. i, 16–19).	Dan. xi, 22–24.
" 170.	Second expedition against Egypt (cfr. I Mach. i, 20).	Dan. xi, 25–27.
" "	On his return from Egypt, Antiochus plunders the Temple and massacres many Jews (cfr. I Mach. i, 21–28; II Mach. v, 11–21).	Dan. viii, 9[b]–10; xi, 28.
" 169	Third expedition against Egypt. The Roman legate Popilius Lænas obliges Antiochus to withdraw.	Dan. xi, 29–30[a].
" 169–168.	Dreadful persecution of the Jews. Jerusalem surprised on Sabbath-day, and many inhabitants either slain or captured and sold as slaves. Syrian garrison placed in the citadel. God-fearing Jews flee and all practices of Yahweh's religion are forbidden. The Temple-worship is suspended on 15 Chis-	Dan. vii, 21, 24[b], 25; viii, 11, 12, 13[b], 24, 25; xx, 26[c], 27[a]; xi, 30[b], 32[a] (renegade Jews), 32[b]–35 (the faithful), 36–39; xii, 1, 7, 11.

[1] The outline is substantially that given by DRIVER Liter of Old Test., p. 4 1 sq., and repeated by E. L. CURTIS in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol i, p. 55 sq. For details concerning the events of Antiochus' reign, see "Outlines of Jewish History," by the present writer, p. 332 sqq.

Digitized by Google

Date.		*Event of Antiochus' Reign.*	*Reference in Daniel.*
		lav, B.C. 168; the "abomination of the desolation" (a heathen altar or idol) set up on the altar of Holocausts. Books of the Law are burnt, and women who had had their children circumcised are put to death (cfr. I Mach. i, 29–64; II Mach. vi–vii).	
B.C.	167.	Revolt of the Machabees (I Mach. ii.)	Dan. xi, 34 ("a small help").
"	165.	After Machabean victories (cfr. I Mach. iv, 28–35, the Temple is purified and public worship re-established just *three years* after its desecration (cfr. I Mach. iv, 36–61).	Dan. viii, 14[b].
"	164.	Antiochus dies suddenly in Persia (cfr. I Mach. vi, 1–16).	Dan. vii, 11, 26; viii. 14[b], 25; ix, 26[a], 27[b], xi, 45[b].

§ 2. *The Proto-Canonical Parts of the Book of Daniel.*

1. **Contents.** The proto-canonical portions of the prophecy of Daniel—which make up the whole book as it stands in the Hebrew Bible—fall naturally into two great divisions. They include, first, a series of narratives in the third person (i–vi), and, secondly, a series of visions in the first person (vii–xii).

The first series opens with a chapter which serves as a preface to the whole work. It introduces to the reader the four heroes of the book, viz., Daniel, Ananias, Misael, and Azarias, describing how these noble youths came to occupy a high rank in Nabuchodonosor's service, without, however, defiling themselves by eating of the king's food.[1] The second chapter—partly a narrative, partly an apocalypse—is clearly intended as an illustration of the wonderful skill in interpreting dreams with which, according to the preceding

[1] The exact relation of i. 21 either to the statements in that chapter or to other parts of the book (cfr. x, 1), cannot be defined. Perhaps it is a later addition to the text (cfr. TROCHON, Daniel, pp. 27, 94; J. M. FULLER, in "the Speaker's Bible"; KNABENBAUER, in Danielem proph., p. 75 sq.).

Digitized by Google

chapter, God had endowed Daniel.[1] The king's dream of a colossal statue made up of various materials and broken up by a small stone which grew into a mountain and filled the whole earth was interpreted by the prophet "as emblematic of four monarchies, only that by the toes of the feet (partly iron and partly clay) a kingdom is pointed out with many contemporaneous kings, some strong and some weak, who should be often externally allied, but yet inwardly disunited. The stone represents a kingdom to which the divine attention shall be principally directed, and which shall destroy those kingdoms, but shall itself remain for ever."[2] The next section (iii, 1–30; in the Vulgate, iii, 1–23, 91–97) narrates how Ananias, Misael, and Azarias were cast into a fiery furnace for refusing to worship the colossal golden statue set up by Nabuchodonosor, and how they remained unharmed, whereupon the king issued a decree in favor of their God, and gave them an unexpected promotion. "This section is distinguished from the rest of the book by the unaccountable absence of Daniel."[3] In the following section (iii, 31–iv; in the Vulg., iii, 98–iv) King Nabuchodonosor is made to recount, in the form of an epistle addressed to the whole world, his dream of a mighty tree cut down by divine decree, and its correct interpretation by Daniel, together with its actual fulfilment in the form of a seven years' madness which had befallen the king, and the recovery from which was the occasion of his thankful epistle. The fifth chapter (in the Aramaic, v–vi, 1) records events which are referred to the end of the reign of the Chaldæan king, Baltassar, son of

[1] Aramaic is used instead of Hebrew in ii, 4^b-vii inclusively.

[2] JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 406 sq. (Engl. Transl.). The parallelism between Dan. ii and Gen. xli (the history of Joseph) is obvious. For useful suggestions in this regard, see A. A. BEVAN, a Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel, p. 64 sqq.

[3] "The Biblical World," Nov. 1898, p. 347. Cfr. BEVAN, loc. cit., p. 78 sq., for a different view.

Digitized by Google

Nabuchodonosor. It describes Baltassar's feast, the handwriting on the wall, Daniel's interpretation, and the destruction, that same night, of Baltassar's kingdom. The last section of the first part of the book includes chap. vi. It transports us to the reign of "Darius the Mede," and recounts that for his faithfulness to one of the positive practices of Judaism Daniel was thrown into the lions' den, where his miraculous preservation led Darius to decree that all his subjects should honor the God of Daniel.

The second part of the book (vii–xii) depicts four visions beheld, and apparently described, by Daniel himself.[1] The opening chapter records a vision which differs from the others in that it assumes the form of a *dream*. It takes us back to the reign of Baltassar and to a Babylonian environment, and to the idea embodied in the apocalyptic dream of chap. ii.[2] The vision was of four beasts coming out of the sea. "The first, in the form of a lion with eagle's wings, rises on its hind feet, and receives the understanding of a man. This is the Chaldæan kingdom, very soon about to assume a milder character. The second, like a bear, stands one side, having three ribs in his mouth. This is the Medo-Persian empire, which had swallowed three kingdoms, the Lydian, the Chaldæan, and the Egyptian. The third monster is like a leopard, with four wings on its back and having four heads. This is the kingdom of Alexander, who with great rapidity overturned the whole Persian empire, and whose monarchy was at last divided into four.[3]

[1] In chap. v, 1 we are told that Daniel "wrote the dream," and henceforth the first person is used in the book, except in the heading of chapter x.

[2] "In both chap. ii and chap. vii there is question of four Gentile empires; in both the fourth empire is dwelt upon at greater length than the first three, and in both it is predicted that the fourth empire will be overthrown by a divine interposition, in order that an everlasting kingdom may be set up." (A. A. Bevan loc. cit., p. 114.)

[3] This interpretation of the first three monsters is in harmony with the view commonly received among Catholic scholars. Another view very prevalent among con-

Digitized by Google

"The fourth monster had no resemblance to the others, but was exceedingly strong and terrible to look at. It had great iron teeth, and what escaped being crushed by them it trampled under foot. It had ten horns, among which there grew up a small horn which tore out three of the others, then became great, was full of eyes, and had a human mouth, with which it blasphemed God. With the intention of changing the law or religion, it made war upon and conquered the saints, who were in subjection for a time, times, and a half of a time. Hereupon the Eternal sits in judgment, commands the monster to be put to death, and the others to be deprived of their dominion, but allows them to live until a definite time. Then came in the clouds a human form and received the dominion, the saints received right, that is to say, they conquered and fortified the kingdom. All this is emblematic of the Greek kingdoms which sprang from the monarchy of Alexander.[1] Although indeed the more considerable of these kingdoms were only four, yet if the less important are added to them, they will approach so near to ten that this round number may very properly be used. The little horn which became great is Antiochus Epiphanes,[2] who prohibited the worship of the true God, and persecuted and made war upon the pious

temporary critics, and going back to St. Ephrem and the Jews of his time, holds that the second empire is the *Median*, and the third the Persian. (Cfr. TROCHON, Daniel, p. 173 sqq.; BEVAN; DRIVER. Introd. to Literat. of Old Testament; etc.)

[1] The fourth monster is taken by many to mean the Roman empire. As far back, however, as Porphyry († 305) it has been understood of the *Greek* or *Macedonian* empire. The latter interpretation, common among the Jews of the fourth century of our era, and adopted by St. Ephrem, is the one received by the great majority of modern critics. Everything considered, it seems more probable that the four empires of Daniel are better explained by Jno. JAHN, whose words are quoted in the text. (Cfr also Dom CALMET, O.S.B., Commentaire littéral sur Daniel, Paris, 1715.)

[2] The terms in which the 'little horn' is here spoken of (vii, 20, 21, 25) are closely analogous to those used also of a "little horn" in viii, 9–13, 23–25, which is admitted to signify Antiochus Epiphanes; hence it is very probable that here that impious prince is intended. (Cfr also I Mach. i. 24; etc.) Many, however, take the "little horn" in Dan. vii to refer directly to Antichrist.

Digitized by Google

Jews. The human figure in the clouds is an emblem of the Machabees."[1]

The vision in chap. viii is also referred to the reign of Baltassar.[2] In it, as in chap. vii, symbolical animals are used to denote empires. Daniel sees a ram with two great horns (the Medo-Persian empire) going from victory to victory, till it is struck by a he-goat (the Greek power) with a sharp horn (Alexander) between his eyes. This sharp horn is broken in its turn, and replaced by four horns (the four larger Greek kingdoms of Egypt, Syria, Macedonia, and Thrace). From one of these four horns, viz., Syria, arises a "little horn," to wit, Antiochus Epiphanes, who, though not named, is clearly designated by the description of the doings of the "little horn" against the host of heaven and against its Prince (God), desecrating His sanctuary and interrupting the daily sacrifice for three years and a fraction. This vision, the explanation of which is given by the angel Gabriel, is clearly parallel to that in chap. vii, and in so far affords a means to get at the meaning of the latter in regard to which no explanation is found in the text.

Chapter ix records how, after confession and prayer by Daniel, Gabriel appeared to him and explained to him the prophecy of Jeremias relative to the forgiveness of God's people, and the restoration of His ruined sanctuary. The angel told him "that it would be, not 70 years, but 70 weeks of years, before the iniquity of the people would be entirely atoned for. This period is then divided into three smaller ones, $7 + 62 + 1$; and it is said (*a*) that 7 weeks (= 49 years) will elapse from the going forth of the command to restore Jerusalem to 'an anointed one, a prince';

[1] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 408 sq. (Engl. Transl.). For detailed information in regard to chap. vii, see KNABENBAUER, loc. cit.; DRIVER, Daniel (in the Cambridge Bible); HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible; Dom CALMET, O.S.B.; etc.

[2] In chap. viii the use of Hebrew is resumed and kept up to the end of the book.

Digitized by Google

(*b*) that for 62 weeks (= 434 years) the city will be rebuilt, though in straitened times; (*c*) that at the end of these 62 weeks 'an anointed one' will be cut off, and the people of a prince that shall come will desolate the city and sanctuary: he will make a covenant with many for one week (= 7 years), and during half of this week he will cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, until his end come and the consummation decreed arrest the desolator."[1]

The last vision includes chaps. x–xii. Its opening part (x–xi, 1) gives a representation of the vision with a reference to the princes (guardian angels) of Media, Persia, and Greece. The second part (xi, 12–45) announces a long series of historical circumstances connected, first, with the doings of four Persian kings and of Alexander, with the rupture of the kingdom of the latter after his death; secondly, and more fully, with the conflicts between Egypt and Syria in the following centuries; and thirdly, and most fully (verses 21–45), with the deeds of Antiochus Epiphanes, his expeditions against Egypt, the persecution of the Jews, the desecration of the Temple, etc. The conclusion of this vision (chap. xii) declares how Michael (the guardian angel of Israel) delivers the people: there will be a resurrection of the dead, followed by rewards and punishments. The tribulation is to last for "a time, times, and half a time," or 1290 days, about three years and a half from the stopping of the daily sacrifice; and a blessing is pronounced upon him who shall continue steadfast till 1335 days.

[1] DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 494 sq. The prophecy of the 70 years is understood by many as predicting directly and exclusively the death of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. (Cfr. CORLUY, Spicilegium dogmatico-biblicum, vol. i, p. 474 sqq.; TROCHON; KNABENBAUER; etc.) Josephus connected it with the time of Antiochus. Several Catholic interpreters (SIXTUS OF SIENNA, O.P.; ESTIUS; HARDOUIN, S.J; etc.) admit a twofold fulfilment, the one in Christ's person and time, the other in the time of Antiochus and the Machabees. This last view has commended itself of late to many unbiassed critics.

Digitized by Google

2. Didactic Purpose and Literary Unity. However different the two parts of the book of Daniel with respect to contents, they have a common general purpose. The first series, made up of narratives, points throughout in one direction. Each one of these stories, though apparently complete in itself, agrees with the others in describing the righteous as rewarded or the wicked as signally punished, as the case may be. On the one hand, the religious constancy and fortitude of Daniel and his friends, the servants of the true God, triumph over all opposition and are rewarded in various ways ; while, on the other hand, the pride and power of the mightiest heathen potentates of the period —Nabuchodonosor, Baltassar, Darius—are confounded and even made to acknowledge and promote the glory of the God of Israel. Nor has the second series, which consists of four distinct visions, a different general purpose. In each vision Divine Providence secures the final victory of the "Saints" over the Gentile powers. Again, this victory of the Saints is to take place during the days of a Gentile king who will surpass all his predecessors in pride and wickedness. This impious prince will arise out of the fourth Gentile empire, and, after fighting against God and His people, will be destroyed by a divine judgment; whereupon Yahweh will set up an everlasting kingdom. So that this second part of Daniel has clearly for its purpose to teach how, though overmastered for a time by heathen nations, God's people is not forsaken, but must ultimately prevail over all hostile powers. The common purpose of both parts of the book is therefore essentially didactic. They both inculcate upon the children of Israel the great truth of God's watchful care over and righteous dealings with His faithful servants individually and His chosen people collectively.

The didactic purpose which thus pervades the whole book

Digitized by Google

of Daniel proves beyond doubt that one and the same author put together the narratives and visions now embodied in its proto-canonical parts, so that the opinion of certain critics of the nineteenth century,[1] that Daniel is a series of "disjecta membra," must be considered as no less untenable than the antiquated "Fragment-Hypothesis" in regard to the composition of Genesis.[2] The denial of the real unity of Daniel cannot be seriously maintained in view of its manifest order of parts, community of purpose, etc. It does not follow necessarily, however, that because that sacred writing is not "a bundle of loose leaves," it should be considered as a perfect literary unit. Its real unity might be—as indeed is actually the case with that of Genesis and many other writings of the Old Testament—directly referred to a compiler who put together such documents as could make for his general purpose. In fact the theory of a compilation in regard to Daniel has commended itself to many scholars of the past,[3] and has several points in its favor. First of all, the narratives in chaps. i–vi look like separate pieces, each one of which recounts a story complete in itself, and something of that independent character may be noticed in connection with the four visions which make up the second part of the book. Again, several sections of Daniel might be regarded as duplicates: compare, for instance, iii, 1–30 (in the Hebrew Bible) with vi; etc.[4] The fact that the whole series of narratives is in the third person, and the whole series of visions is in the first, is also best accounted for by supposing that a compiler simply preserved that feature of the respective documents at his dis-

[1] Among them may be named BERTHOLDT; P. A. DE LAGARDE; etc.

[2] Concerning the "Fragment-Hypothesis," see "Special Introd. to the Historical Books of the Old Test.," p 36.

[3] Among them may be mentioned SOUCIET, S.J.; JAHN; Bp HANNEBERG; etc.

[4] Cfr. George A. BARTON, in the "Journal of Biblical Literature," vol. xvii, p. 1. See also "the Biblical World." Nov. 1898, p. 347 sq.

Digitized by Google

posal. Finally, the book of Daniel, as shown by a close study of its contents, and as held by most scholars of the present day, is an apocalyptic writing,[1] and all such writings bear the impress of compilation.[2]

Despite these and other such arguments in favor of the compilatory character of the book of Daniel, its literary unity is generally admitted by both the defenders and the opponents of the traditional authorship of that inspired writing. The uniform plan of the book and the studied arrangement of its subject-matter point in that direction. "The two leading divisions are so related that the one implies the existence of the other. Both have the same characteristics of style, spirit, ideas, and manner. Thus i, 17 refers to ii, 16, etc.; i, 19, 20 and ii, 49 refer to iii, 12; i, 2 is meant to prepare the way for v, 2. Compare iii, 12 with ii, 49; v, 11 and ii, 48; v, 21 and iv, 22; vi, 1 and v, 30; viii, 1 and vii, 2; ix, 21 and viii, 16; xii, 7 and vii, 25. Not only do the constituents of the two parts hang together among themselves, presenting similar features, but they also refer to one another. Hence ii, 4–vi and vii–xii, with i–ii, 3 cannot be assigned to two authors, the second prior to the first, and having the latter as an introduction to it. They have the strongest similarity in language and tenor, pointing unmistakably to one and the same author."[3] It might be objected, it is true, that two distinct languages (Hebrew and Aramaic) are employed in the book. But not only do these languages appear in each part and therefore do not imply duality of authorship, they rather point to one and the same original writer. It is precisely the same style of lan-

[1] Cfr VIGOUROUX, Bible et Découvertes modernes; WESTCOTT, art. Daniel, in SMITH, Bib'e Dict

[2] The compilatory character of the Apocalypse of St. John will be examined in a forthcoming volume on "Special Introduction to the Books of the New Testament."

[3] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 162. This literary unity is maintained by PUSEY; KLEEK; KUENEN; PRINCE; BEVAN; DEANE; VIGOUROUX; TROCHON; KNABENBAUER; LESÊTRE; CORNELY; DRIVER; KAMPHAUSEN; etc., etc.

Digitized by Google

guage—the same phrases, the same forms, the same words, many of them being peculiar to the book of Daniel—which occurs in both the Hebrew and the Aramaic sections. Hence it is highly probable that the entire work was written at first in Hebrew, and soon translated into Aramaic for the use of the general reader, and that at a later date, certain parts of the Hebrew Text being lost, the missing places were supplied from the current Aramaic Version. It has also been objected that, since the book is divided into sections more or less independent of each other, its composite authorship must be admitted. But this division, it is answered, was simply intended to facilitate the diffusion of the work. "In those days it was by being read aloud in public that books became known, and a series of separate narratives and visions is obviously better adapted for reading aloud than a continuous history. This explains also why the author so often seems to ignore events already narrated. It has been asked, for example, why in chap. ii, 2, and still more in chap. iv, 3, Nabuchodonosor summons the Chaldæan sages instead of summoning Daniel, whose superior wisdom had been so clearly proved. The real answer is that, in each case, the author constructs his narrative with a view to inculcating a particular lesson, and does not care to make the narratives strictly consistent. But the general spirit and tendency of the book are everywhere the same."[1]

3. **Authorship and Date.** Taking it, then, for granted that there was only one author, or at least only one final editor,[2] of the book of Daniel, there remains to examine the important question whether this sole writer is Daniel or, on

[1] A. A. BEVAN, the Book of Daniel. p 25.

[2] There can be no doubt that, in supposing the book of Daniel to be a compilation, its final editor must be considered as having left upon all its contents the impress of his mind and of his style.

Digitized by Google

the contrary, some one, now unknown, who composed the work at a later date that can still be pointed out. The traditional view concerning the authorship refers the whole book to the prophet whose name it bears. It maintains that, apart from numerous alterations introduced into the text in the course of ages,[1] both the narratives wherein Daniel seems to be described by somebody as acting as he does, and the visions wherein he appears to describe himself as the recipient of heavenly revelations, were written not only by one who was contemporary with that prophet and lived in Chaldæa in the sixth century before Christ, but by no other than Daniel himself. The prophet, it is said, naturally used the third person in recording events, for the event is its own witness, and the first person in noting his visions and revelations, for such communications from Heaven need the personal attestation of those to whom they are made.[2] Hence the date of the book of Daniel is 570–536 B.C.

The first series of arguments in favor of this time-honored position consists in the various extrinsic testimonies to that effect. Christian tradition, in both the Greek and the Latin Churches, from Our Lord's time to the present day, is practically unanimous in admitting that Daniel is the author of the book that bears his name. Its special basis is no other than Christ's own words in St. Matt. xxiv, 15, recognizing Daniel's oracles as true prophecies, and distinctly naming that prophet as their writer.[3] In thus speaking freely of the author of that inspired book Our Lord appar-

[1] The text of Daniel in the Hebrew Bible is confessedly very defective in both its Hebrew and its Aramaic sections. Cfr. E. PHILIPPE, art. Daniel (le Livre de), in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 1269 sq., and the authors referred to there.

[2] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1057; and WESTCOTT, art. Daniel, in SMITH, Bible Dict., vol. i, p. 542 (Amer. Edit.). Westcott adds, however, that "the peculiarity arose from the manner in which the book assumed its final shape."

[3] Cfr. also I Petr i, 10 sqq. with Daniel xii, 8 sqq.; II Thessal. ii, 3 sqq. with Dan. vii, 8, 25; Heb. xi, 33, 34 with Dan. vii and iii; etc.

Digitized by Google

ently endorsed and confirmed by His authority the view which must have been current among the Jews of His time, and which is in fact embodied in the writings of Josephus (first century of our era). According to this learned priest and Pharisee, "the book of Daniel was placed before Alexander the Great († 323 B.C.), wherein Daniel declared that one of the Greeks should destroy the Persian empire."[1] Before the Christian era the first book of the Machabees shows acquaintance with the book of Daniel, and this in the form of the Alexandrian translation of it,[2] so that at that period this prophetic writing must have been some time translated into Greek.[3] The Sibylline Oracles (book iii, verse 388 sqq.) contain an allusion to Antiochus Epiphanes and the ten horns of Daniel vii, 7; x, 24.[4] But more particularly "the Septuagint translation even of the Pentateuch bears traces of acquaintance with the book of Daniel, from which it has drawn the doctrine of tutelary angels presiding over heathen kingdoms, introduced by it into the passage Deuter. xxxii, 8; comp. also Isai. xxx, 4 (Sept.).[5] Finally, Josephus is authority for the statement that the Palestinian Canon, which has ever reckoned Daniel among the "Writings," was closed at the time of Esdras (middle of the fifth century B.C.). Now at that early date the genuineness of the book could easily be ascertained, and was to all appearance the reason for which Daniel was inserted among the sacred writings of the Jews of Palestine. The tradition thus started has always been preserved in the Jewish and the Christian Church.

However plausible and cogent the external evidence in

[1] Antiquities of the Jews, book xi, chap. viii, § 5.

[2] Cfr. I Mach. i, 54 with Dan. ix, 27; I Mach. ii, 59, 60 with Dan. iii (in the LXX).

[3] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1055.

[4] Cfr. E. B. PUSEY, Lectures on Daniel, p. 364 sqq. (2d edit.).

[5] KEIL, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii, p. 11 sq (Engl. Transl.). Cfr. also JAHN, Introd. to Old Test., p. 415 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

favor of the traditional authorship of Daniel has appeared in past ages, and still appears to some writers, a very large number of contemporary critics reject it as inconclusive. They think that Our Lord's references to Daniel and the book that bears his name are not stronger or more decisive in regard to authorship than those more numerous, and certainly more pointed, which He made to Moses and the Pentateuch, and which are very commonly regarded in the present day as not precluding a scientific examination of the question and a solution adverse to the Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Bible.[1] They do not admit that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch should necessarily be considered as showing traces of acquaintance with the book of Daniel because it brings into Deuter. xxxii, 8 the doctrine of guardian angels over heathen kingdoms. The few words referring to that doctrine and found in the Canticle of Moses[2] may be simply a later gloss inserted into the text;[3] and even supposing that they are traceable to the Septuagint translators themselves, the doctrine may have been got from another source beside the book of Daniel.[4] As regards Josephus' testimony which refers the closing of the Hebrew Canon to the time of Nehemias and Esdras, most contemporary scholars rightly set it aside as untrue to fact,[5] so that it cannot be inferred from it, with anything like probability, that the Jewish tradition concerning the authorship of Daniel truly goes back to a period so near the time at which the book is claimed to have been written. In view of these and other strictures on the exter-

[1] Cfr. "Special Introd. to the Study of the Old Testament, vol. i, the Historical Books" by the present writer, pp. 33, 50-52.

[2] These words are κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγλέλων θεοῦ.

[3] DRIVER, Deuteronomy (Internat. Crit. Comment), p. 356.

[4] Cfr. Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 164.

[5] Cfr. "General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures." by the present writer, p 29 sqq. PUSEY's strenuous efforts to establish the opposite view simply evince his desire to uphold an antiquated opinion (Lectures on the Prophet Daniel, Lect. vi).

Digitized by Google

nal testimonies .n favor of the traditional authorship of the book of Daniel, it is easy to understand how, especially of late, the defenders of that time-honored position have done their utmost to show that intrinsic arguments point to Daniel himself, or at least to a writer contemporary with that prophet.

They maintain, first of all, that the internal direct evidence supplied by the second part of the book of Daniel, when taken together with the generally-granted unity of that inspired writing, are a proof of the Danielic authorship. "Throughout that second part Daniel speaks in the first person, and thereby gives himself implicitly as the writer of chaps. vii–xii (cfr. Dan. vii, 1–6, 13, 15–19, 21, 28; viii, 1–6, 13, 15–19, 26, 27; ix, 2–9, 13, 20–22; x, 2–12, 15–21; xi, 2; see also xii, 1, 4–9, 13). Moreover, he gives himself explicitly as the author, for we read in Dan. vii, 1: 'then he [Daniel] wrote the dream and told the sum of the matters.' These words prove directly that he *wrote* at least that first vision (vii), and indirectly that he recorded also the subsequent visions which are indissolubly bound up with the first. Cfr. Dan. viii, 26, and especially xii, 4, 9 as commented upon by J. Knabenbauer in Dan., pp. 221, 317. But if the prophetical visions must be attributed to Daniel, the same thing must be admitted in regard to the narratives (i–vi) because of the intimate union between narratives and visions, and because of the proved unity of the book—which is tantamount to say that the whole work must be ascribed to him."[1]

It can be readily perceived that this appeal to the direct testimony of the book of Daniel is far from convincing. The passages pointed out as affirming that Daniel is the

[1] E. PHILIPPE, art Daniel (le Livre de), in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 1257. Cfr also KEIL, Introd. to Old Test., vol. ii, p. 10 (Engl. Transl.); CORNELY, Introd. in U. T. libros sacros, vol. ii, part ii, p. 488; etc.

Digitized by Google

author are not more conclusive than those usually quoted from the books of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy as affirming the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.[1] And the fact that the prophet Daniel is spoken of in the first person throughout the second part of the book that bears his name does not necessarily prove that he is its writer, for the same fact is not an absolute proof in favor either of the Mosaic authorship of the discourses in Deuteronomy, or of the Solomonic authorship of Wisdom. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that the defenders of the Danielic authorship have fallen back upon internal indirect evidence to strengthen their position. They have endeavored to set forth in this wise a cumulative argument which will appear all the more cogent because it is of that description which is chiefly used against the traditional view by recent critics. In fact several among them—for example, F. Vigouroux,[2] G. Brunengo,[3] F. Kaulen,[4] etc.—have dilated at great length on the harmony between the data supplied by the book of Daniel and the recent historical, geographical, and archæological discoveries made in Assyria and Babylonia during the nineteenth century. The following is an outline of their reasoning.

The first and principal link in this cumulative argument is drawn from such close acquaintance on the part of the writer of Daniel with the manners, customs, history, and religion of Babylonia as only a resident in that country could be fairly supposed to possess.

This exact knowledge is evinced by the account in chap. i, 3 that young men of noble birth were selected from the captives of Judæa to be brought up in the royal palace with a view to enter into the king's service, for in the inscrip-

[1] Cfr. "Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Test.," part i, p. 57 sqq.
[2] VIGOUROUX, Bible et Découvertes modernes, vol. iv, pp. 421–577 (5th edit.).
[3] G. BRUNENGO, l'Impero di Babilonia e di Ninive.
[4] KAULEN, Assyrien und Babylonien, 2d edit., pp. 103–129.

Digitized by Google

tions of Sennacherib we accidentally learn that he had such a school in his palace in Ninive for the children of nobles of his foreign provinces.[1] No less in opposition to Hebrew customs, but also no less in harmony with Babylonian civilization, is the intrusting of such youths to the "chief of the eunuchs," who naturally held an important position at the Babylonian court (i, 4). The statement that the Jewish captives were taught "the learning (literally, the *books*) and the tongue of the Chaldæans" bespeaks an acquaintance on the part of the writer with the difficulties which a Jew would meet in the study of the living language of Assyria or Babylon, made up of so many combinations of arrow-headed or wedge-shaped characters, different pronunciations of which gave wholly different meanings to the same word,[2] and also in the study of the non-Semitic Sumerian (or Accadian), a long-dead language in which all the venerable treatises on the gods, on science, and on magic were preserved. That Daniel and his companions should be given new names on entering the school opened to them by royal favor (i, 7) is in accordance with the custom of the age. Psammetichus, the famous king of Egypt, when living in Ninive had the Assyrian name of Nabu-ushezibanni ("Nebo saves me") given him by Assurbanipal. Similarly, that of Daniel ("God is my judge") was changed to Balatsu-usur or Baltassar, "(Bel) protect his life," and that of one of his companions from Azarias ("Yahweh has helped") to Abdenego, generally recognized as a corruption of Abed-*nebo*, "servant of Nebo," which frequently occurs in Assyrian documents. Ananias and Misael, his other associates, had also their names changed, the one to Sidrach and

[1] Cfr. Bellino's cylinder, line 14 (Records of the Past, 1st Series, p. 26). As the civilization of Babylon is identical with that of Assyria, the inscriptions of Assyria may be used freely to illustrate Babylonian customs and manners.

[2] For details, see J. MENANT, la Bibliothèque du palais de Ninive, pp. 40–43, quoted by VIGOUROUX, Bible et Découvertes modernes, vol. iv, p. 437 sq. (5th edit.).

Digitized by Google

the other to Misach, the Babylonian or rather Sumerian origin of which is very probable, though their exact meaning is not fully ascertained.[1] The credit which, as we are told in Daniel i, 20; ii, 2; iv, 3, the Magi enjoyed with the Babylonians at large, and with the Babylonian kings in particular, is confirmed not only by statements in classical writers; but also by a series of reports which were made by the Magi and which have been recovered of late.[2] Again, "acquaintance so minute with the ideas prevalent in Babylon as to the importance attached to dreams, their professed interpretation by the rules of astrology and magic, the different classes of 'wise men,' the high rank they held in the State, the punishments inflicted at the royal will, and even the Babylonian proper names of the period, are silent witnesses to the truthfulness of the book in which they are found (cfr. Daniel ii). Such petty details and exact local coloring imply a contemporary authorship of at least parts of our book of Daniel."[3] The composite statue seen by Nabuchodonosor in his dream is no less strictly Babylonian as regards its component materials.[4] The incident of the golden image set up by the same monarch in the plain of Dura, and of the punishment by fire inflicted on Daniel's companions who refused to worship that idol, is in its various details, notably in regard to the plain of Dura, the throwing into a furnace, the description of the dress of the courtiers, etc., in harmony with recent discoveries or hints

[1] Cfr. DRIVER, Daniel (Cambridge Bible), p. 7. In this connection F. LENORMANT pertinently writes: "All the proper names (in Daniel), when not altered beyond recovery by the errors of copyists, are strictly Babylonian, and could not have been invented in Palestine in the second century before Christ." the date to which the composition of Daniel is referred by many critics. (Cfr. La Divination chez les Chaldéens, p. 182.)

[2] Records of the Past, 1st Series p. 153 sqq.

[3] C. GEIKIE, Hours with the Bible, vol. vi, p. 275 sq. (new edit.). Cfr. VIGOUROUX, loc cit., p. 447 sqq.

[4] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, loc. cit., p. 456 sqq.

Digitized by Google

of ancient authors.[1] That some terrible illness—not unlike that detailed in Daniel (iv)—seized Nabuchodonosor is not, of course, mentioned in the records of his reign, but seems to be implied in "a bronze doorstep presented by him to the great temple of E Saggil at Borsippa. It speaks of his having been afflicted, and of his restoration to health, and may well have been a votive offering to the gods on his recovery from the attack mentioned in Daniel. Nor is this at all inconsistent with his recorded homage to Yahweh. Though he honored the whole of the gods, his inscriptions show that in a restricted sense he always worshipped one god especially. . . . He might therefore have for the time transferred to Yahweh, perhaps as another name for his own Merodach (of whom he repeatedly speaks as 'the king of the gods' and 'the god of gods'), the homage hitherto rendered to the Babylonian idol."[2] Of the words put into the mouth of Nabuchodonosor in iv, 27, regarding the glories of Babylon under him, Dr. Prince[3] rightly says: "There is no doubt that this speech of the king is quite in accordance with historical facts." The mention of the presence of women at feasts in chap. v, 2 is confessedly in agreement with Babylonian custom,[4] and the statement in the same chapter (verse v) that a man's hand appeared writing on the white "plaster (literally *chalk*) of the wall of the king's palace" shows that the writer was acquainted with the actual finish of the great walls of Babylonian palaces.[5] In the last historical section (chap. vi) mention is repeatedly made (verses 8, 12, 15) of the law of the *Medes and Persians*, implying that in the writer's time the

[1] Cfr. E PHILIPPE, art. Daniel (le Livre de), in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 1253. See also CHEYNE's admissions in Encyclop. Britannica, art. Daniel (Book of).

[2] GEIKIE, loc. cit., p. 283 sq.

[3] A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, p. 89. See also DRIVER, Daniel (Cambridge Bible), pp. 55, xxiv sq.

[4] CHEYNE. loc. cit.

[5] F. KAULEN, Assyrien und Babylonien. pp. 52, 109. Cfr. DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 63.

Digitized by Google

Persians had not yet obtained that recognition of their influence which is conveyed by the formula: "the *Persians* and *Medes*," found in Esther i, 3, 14, 18.[1]

As a close study of the historical part of Daniel discloses the writer's acquaintance with the names, ideas, customs, etc., of Babylonia, so that of the prophetical part (vii–xii) shows that its author is familiar with Babylonian surroundings. "The symbolic form of Daniel's prophecies suits well the place of their delivery. In chaps. viii, 2 and x, 4 he represents river banks as the scenes of his visions. This was very appropriate for a prophet in Babylon, but not for one in Palestine. . . . The imagery of Daniel's vision in the seventh chapter is nearly the same as that found on monuments in the ruins of Ninive. Daniel speaks of a lion that had *eagle's wings*, and of a leopard that had *four* wings. Here we are strongly reminded of the winged bull and other figures excavated by Layard."[2]

While thus very familiar with Babylonia, the author of the book of Daniel betrays no such special knowledge of Persia and Greece as would naturally be the case if, instead of being a contemporary of Daniel, he had lived about the middle of the second century before Christ. And this forms a second link in the cumulative argument in favor of the traditional view of the authorship. "His knowledge of Persia is very slight. He does not even profess to have lived later than Cyrus, and consequently he only knew Persia, as it were, in her infancy. He was only aware of three Persian kings after Cyrus (xi, 2), instead of a series of monarchs whose united reigns extended over nearly two hundred years. He was aware of the existence of Greece, and claims to have received a revelation that the power of Greece would overthrow the Persian empire,

[1] E. PHILIPPE, loc. cit., col. 1259.
[2] H. M. HARMAN, Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, p. 386 (3d edit.).

Digitized by Google

and that the Greek empire would only last during the reign of the first king. But he is uninformed of the important stages by which the Persian empire was dissolved and superseded by the Grecian.

"Of historical events that occurred after the establishment of the Greek empire he knows still less. It is revealed to him that the Greek empire would finally be divided into four parts, and perhaps also that two of these should materially influence the fortunes of his people; but it is remarkable that there is an absence of anything like minute accuracy in the delineation of many of the most important events of this time. While certain events, such as the wars of Ptolemy Philopator and Antiochus the Great, or the persecutions in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, may perhaps be pointed out, yet other events of great importance are omitted, such as the Machabean wars, and others are described in such a way as is not recorded in history, such as the death of Antiochus.

"It appears, then, that the internal evidence, slight though it is, favors the hypothesis that the author lived in the Babylonian period rather than later."[1]

The third link in the cumulative argument drawn from indirect internal evidence consists in the linguistic features of the book of Daniel. It is claimed, first of all, that "the easy transition from the Hebrew to the Chaldee (Aramaic) language (ii, 4), and the reverse (viii, 1 sqq.), is explicable only on the supposition that the writer and the readers of the book had equal fluency in both. This does not suit the Machabean age, in which the prevalence of the Aramaic dialect had led to the disuse of Hebrew, the knowledge of which was therefore propagated only by learned study; but

[1] H. DEANE, in Plain Introductions to the Books of the Bible, edited by Bp ELLICOTT, vol. i, p. 286. It will be seen later that DEANE has somewhat exaggerated the lack of acquaintance of the writer of the book of Daniel with Greek matters.

Digitized by Google

it suits perfectly the time of Daniel or of the Exile, in which the people had learned the Chaldee dialect, but had not yet unlearned their Hebrew mother tongue."[1] In the second place, it is affirmed that the Hebrew of Daniel is that of the exilic period. It abounds in Aramaisms, and bears a close affinity to the language of Ezechiel, i.e. of the great prophet who most certainly belongs to the Exile.[2] Finally, the Aramaic portions of Daniel, we are told, are in wonderful agreement with those of Esdras, while they are distinguished by many Hebrew idioms from that of the earliest Targums or Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament.[3] Hence the natural inference which was drawn long ago by J. D. Michaelis († 1791) in the following terms: "Ex his similibusque Danielis et Esdræ Hebraismis, qui his libris peculiares sunt, intelliges, utrumque librum eo tempore scriptum fuisse, quo recens adhuc vernacula sua admiscentibus Hebræis lingua Chaldaica, non seriore tempore confictum. In Targumim enim, antiquissimis etiam, plerumque frustra hos Hebraismos quæsieris, in Daniele et Esdra ubique obvios."[4]

As a last argument drawn from internal indirect evidence appeal is made to the prophetical character of the book of Daniel. "The author," it is said, "though not claiming the title of prophet, and not anywhere styled as such in the Old Testament, yet claims to have received certain revelations from God. If, therefore, he was desirous that his book should be received by his contemporaries, he must have lived at a time when the gift of prediction or the spirit of prophecy was still extant. But this gift was ex-

[1] KEIL, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. ii. p. 12 (Engl. Transl.). Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1055; Abbé LESÊTRE, à l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 611.

[2] Cfr. Elie PHILIPPE, art. Daniel (le Livre de), in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 1271 sq

[3] Besides KEIL and PHILIPPE, see PUSEY, Lectures on Daniel, the Prophet, pp, 45-52 (2d Edit. 1868).

[4] J. D. MICHAELIS, Gramm. Chald., p. 25, quoted by KEIL, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

tinct in the times of Esdras and Nehemias. It is therefore necessary to place the book of Daniel at an earlier period: it would certainly be inconsistent with the Machabean times to suppose that so great a seer as Daniel could have then existed, for, according to the trustworthy historian of those times, the people then complained of the entire absence of prophets (I Mach. iv, 45, 46; ix, 27; xiv, 41)."[1] A similar conclusion is inferred from the peculiarities in Daniel's prophecies, which are conformed to the times of the Exile and to the personal position of the prophet. "They are neither prophetic discourses, whose matter consists of rebukes, and threatenings, and promises; nor are they symbolic actions which embody prophetic truths; but they describe, in images and symbols, with many features of minute detail and with extremely special predictions, the future configuration of the empires of the world, their struggle with the kingdom of God, and its final victory over all the hostile worldly powers. This peculiar character of Daniel's prophecies corresponds in general to the relations introduced by the Exile, by which the theocracy was delivered over to the historical process of the empires of the world; and its continued existence and its configuration in the more distinct future were so swallowed up in their course of development that it could attain to its destined glory only through their overthrow. But besides, and in particular, the character of these prophecies corresponds to Daniel's position at the Babylonian court, to his initiation into the wisdom of the Chaldees, and to the problem of his calling as God had shown it to him. For, in order to manifest to the proud and insolent rulers of Babylon that the earthly wisdom and skill of their magi was a nonentity, and at the same time to manifest to them the hidden wisdom of the Almighty God and Lord of heaven and

[1] H. Deane, loc. cit., p. 286 sq.

Digitized by Google

earth, it was necessary that Divine Revelation should enter into the form of the wisdom known to them, and esteemed more highly than anything else by them, and into its symbolism and its figurative language, and so overcome them and put them to shame. Now this revelation was in its final aim destined for the covenant people, and was meant to impart to them light and comfort and strength, that they might persevere in the faith during the times of severe impending tribulation, while their fortunes continued interwoven with the process of the heathen empires, until the Messias should renew the theocracy. And if this object was to be attained, the revelation must unveil the whole course of the entanglement of the theocracy with the empires of the world, and must represent it as much as possible by the plainest images and the most distinct and determinate sketches. . . . But a very strong proof of the genuineness of the prophecies of this book lies in this their peculiarly constituted nature, so thoroughly corresponding to the position of Daniel, and also to the necessities of the covenant people."[1]

Such, in substance, is the internal indirect evidence which is usually brought forth in favor of the Danielic authorship. As might naturally be expected, its value is variously rated by different scholars. While some regard it as very great, especially in reference to the first six chapters of Daniel,[2] most, even of the defenders of the traditional view, think that it is not considerable.[3] In point of fact some of the parts of this cumulative argument when closely examined do not seem to be solidly established. It

[1] KEIL, loc. cit., p. 17. Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Bible et Découvertes modernes, vol. iv, p. 421 sq. (5th edit.); Abbé GILLY, Précis d'Introd., vol. iii, p. 140.

[2] This is the case with F. LENORMANT, J. MÉNANT, and a few other archæologists.

[3] DEANE, for instance, in a passage already cited, speaks of the internal evidence as "slight," and other advocates of the authorship consider it simply as a confirmation of the external evidence (cfr. CORNELY, Compendium Introd., p. 418).

Digitized by Google

is certainly incorrect to appeal to the twofold language used in the book as proving its composition in "the time of Daniel, or of the Exile, in which the people had learned the Chaldee dialect, but had not yet unlearned their Hebrew mother tongue." The "Aramaic" used in ii, 4–vii is a *Western* Aramaic dialect of the type spoken, not in Babylonia, but in and about Palestine. "The idea that the Jews forgot their Hebrew in Babylonia, and spoke in 'Chaldee' when they returned to Palestine, is unfounded. Aggeus and Zacharias and other post-exilic writers use Hebrew: Aramaic is exceptional. Hebrew was still normally used about 430 B.C. in Jerusalem (Nehem. xiii, 24). The Hebrews, after the Captivity, acquired gradually the use of Aramaic *from their neighbors* in and about Palestine."[1] It is hardly less incorrect to represent the Hebrew of Daniel as being that of the exilic period. As far back as nearly fifty years ago, the learned and conservative critic Frz. Delitzsch admitted that "the Hebrew [of Daniel] when compared with that of ancient authors, as well as the Mishna, exhibits many peculiarities and much harshness of style, but bears resemblance to that of the chroniclers who wrote at the opening of the Greek period (third century B.C.),"[2] and his view has been fully endorsed by the best Hebrew scholars of England, Germany, and other countries.[3] Again, "that the author does not address his contemporaries in his own name, after the manner of the ancient prophets, but clothes his teaching in the

[1] DRIVER, Daniel (Cambridge Bible), p. lix. See also William WRIGHT. Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, p. 16; Th. NÖLDEKE, art. Aramaic Language, in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. i, col. 282, § 4; A. A. BEVAN, Daniel, p 33 sqq.

[2] Franz DELITZSCH, art. Daniel, in SCHAFF-HERZOG, Encyclop. of Religious Knowledge.

[3] Cfr. A. A. BEVAN, loc. cit., p. 28 sqq.; DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test.; and Comm. on Daniel, in Cambridge Bible; Edw. KÖNIG, Einleitung in das A. T., § 80; etc.

Digitized by Google

form of narratives and visions, is perfectly in accordance with the spirit of later Judaism. . . . The book of Daniel belongs to the late apocalyptic literature of Israel, and is the earliest known example thereof."[1] Even that part of the argument which is concerned with the writer's knowledge of the Babylonian manners, customs, history, etc., is decidedly weaker in favor of the traditional authorship of Daniel than the corresponding part of the intrinsic evidence in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Now since, in the latter case, the facts invoked do not bear out the view that our entire Pentateuch should be considered as the work of Moses,[2] a similar conclusion must needs be admitted in regard to the former, viz., that the writer's acquaintance with Babylon is not absolutely cogent in favor of the Danielic authorship. All that the data brought forward by the defenders of the traditional view can strictly prove—on the supposition that they are correctly stated—is that the narratives in the first six chapters of Daniel are based on some oral traditions faithfully preserved, written documents simply imbedded, or the like. But this position is far from the conclusion which the defenders of the Danielic authorship would commonly have us infer from the facts to which they appeal. It comes nearer to a modification of the traditional view, which goes as far back as the eighteenth century, when it was maintained by Souciet, S.J., and which has since been advocated, though with some changes, by Jahn, Bp. Hanneberg, Quatremère, Fr. Lenormant, and others.[3] According to them, "the final redaction of the book, as it has come down to us, is not the work of the prophet Daniel. The

[1] A. A. Bevan, loc. cit., p. 24.

[2] Cfr. "Special Introd. to the Books of the Old Test.," part i, p. 76, by the present writer.

[3] Cfr. Rabbi Wogue's admissions, Histoire de la Bible et de l'Exégèse Biblique, p 76.

Digitized by Google

book is a collection of documents on Daniel's person, deeds, and visions. The Jews ascribe the collection of the parts which they regard as inspired to the Great Synagogue, i.e. to the Sanhedrin, which since Esdras' time guided the Hebrew nation in most important matters. That collection was added to at a later date. In this way certain objections, notably those urged against the discrepant chronological data of the isolated parts, fall to the ground."[1] This altered form of the traditional opinion has this decided advantage over the commonly received view of the Danielic authorship: it does not appear so one-sided, inasmuch as it takes into account not only those points which seem to make for the Danielic authorship, but also opposite data no less truly afforded by the careful and impartial study of the contents of the book.

It is chiefly because of these opposite data that a comparatively recent theory rejecting Daniel's authorship has been widely accepted by contemporary scholars.[2] Intrinsic evidence, it is said, points not to Daniel and his time, but to a different writer and period, as the true author and date of the book of Daniel now contained in the Hebrew Bible. It leads one to look upon that canonical writing not precisely as a record of historical events, but rather as an apocalypse composed by an unknown author and belonging as a whole to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 175–164). The following are the principal data of internal evidence which are usually set forth as disproving the Danielic authorship.

[1] Bp. HANNEBERG, Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i, p. 444 (French Transl.). Cfr. Trochon, Daniel (in LETHIELLEUX' Bible), p. 57.

[2] Apart from PORPHYRY's treatise (at the end of the third century of our era) denying the genuineness of Daniel's prophecy, and whose views are known to us through St. JEROME's Commentary on Daniel, the first systematic rejection of the authorship was by H. CORRODI in 1783. Since that time the authorship has been denied by BERTHOLD; EICHHORN; GESENIUS; BLEEK; DE WETTE; EWALD; HITZIG; STRACK; DELITZSCH; REUSS; BRIGGS; SAYCE; DRIVER; KÖNIG; PRINCE; BENNETT; CURTIS; KAUTZSCH; P. HAUPT; etc

Digitized by Google

First of all, attention is called to the fact that the book contains no allusion to certain events which must needs have deeply interested *a Jewish contemporary of Nabuchodonosor and Cyrus;* for instance, the captivity of King Joakim, the destruction of Jerusalem by Nabuchodonosor, the edict of Cyrus and consequent Return of the Exiles. The force of this negative argument can be best appreciated by contrasting the constant interest evinced by Jeremias and Ezechiel in the history of their time. "Nor is the silence to be explained by the hypothesis that Daniel was a recluse or a man indifferent to the fate of his people. On the contrary, he lives in the midst of the world, at the courts of successive kings, and his zeal for 'his people and his holy city' is intense (see chap. ix)."[1]

This argument *ex silentio* is confirmed, it is said, by another of a positive kind. Besides not referring to such important events of the period which is considered as his time, the author of Daniel is often inaccurate when he actually alludes to incidents of that same period. First he declares (i, 1) that "in the third year of the reign of Joakim, king of Juda, Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylon, came to Jerusalem and besieged it," the obvious meaning of which is that Nabuchodonosor as king of Babylon[2] besieged the Holy City during the *third* year[3] of Joakim (605 B.C.).

[1] A. A. BEVAN, The Book of Daniel, p. 16.

[2] That Nabuchodonosor was already king of Babylon appears from the fact that the title is applied to him in exactly the same way as to Joakim, who was in the third year of his reign.

[3] In the opening verse of Daniel both the siege of the Holy City and Nabuchodonosor's coming to besiege it are obviously ascribed to the third year. Hence many scholars regard as groundless the plea often made to defend the absolute accuracy of Daniel (i, 1), viz., that the Hebrew *ba'*, "came," may be taken with reference to the starting-point of Nabuchodonosor's expedition, virtually as equivalent to "set out," so that the Babylonian king, having started on the *third* year, would have actually besieged Jerusalem only in the *fourth* year, of Joakim's reign. Besides, the military movements of Nabuchodonosor immediately before and after the battle of Carchemis (605 B.C.) preclude the possibility of a siege of Jerusalem at that early date in his Western conquests. Finally, the interpretation of the Hebrew verb *ba'*, "came," 22

Digitized by Google

Now, from Jerem. xxv, 1 and xli, 2 we know that the Babylonian monarch did not begin his reign until the *fourth* year of the Jewish king; and from Jerem. xxxvi, 9, 29 it appears that as late as the ninth month of the *fifth* year of Joakim the Chaldæan invasion of Juda had not yet occurred. Whence it is inferred that had the author of Daniel been a Jewish contemporary of Nabuchodonosor, his statement would have been more accurate.

Secondly, he uses repeatedly the word "Chaldæans" as the name of a *learned caste*,[1] and not of a *nation*. Now this sense "is foreign to the Assyro-Babylonian language, and wherever it occurs has formed itself after the end of the Babylonian empire; it is thus a sure indication of the post-exilic composition of the book of Daniel."[2] The first trace of this meaning of the word "Chaldæans" is found in Herodotus (ab. 440 B.C), and its origin goes back to the time when the term had become synonymous with "Babylonian" in general, and when virtually the only "Chaldæans" known were members of the priestly or learned class. The verdict of Prof. Sayce, a witness certainly not prejudiced against traditional views, on this point is to the following effect: "It is a sense which was unknown in the age of Nabuchodonosor or of Cyrus, and its employment implies not only that the period was long since past when Babylonia enjoyed a political life of its own, but also that the period had come when a Jewish writer could assign to a Hebrew word a signification derived from its Greek equivalent. This last fact is of considerable importance, if we would determine the age of the book of Daniel. . . . In the eyes of the Assyriologist the use of the word *Kasdim* (Chaldæans)

equivalent to "set out," is treated by so prominent a Hebrew scholar as Driver as "opposed to Hebrew usage" (DRIVER, Daniel, in Cambridge Bible. p. 3). Cfr. Comment on Daniel by KNABENBAUER, S.J.; TROCHON; PRINCE; BEVAN; etc.

[1] Cfr. i, 4; ii, 2, 4, 5, 10; iii, 8; iv, 7; v, 7, 11.

[2] Eberhard SCHRADER, die Keilinschriften und das A.T., p. 429 (2d edit.).

Digitized by Google

would alone be sufficient to indicate the date of the work with unerring certainty."[1] To meet this part of the cumulative argument against the authorship, the advocates of the traditional view have set forth only vague remarks[2] or gratuitous suppositions.[3]

Thirdly, Baltassar is repeatedly called king (v, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, etc.; viii, 1), and has his own court at Babylon. He is a king of Chaldæa (v, 30), which is called his kingdom (v, 26–28), and the years of his reign are counted in the book of Daniel in exactly the same manner as those of the other monarchs of the period (viii, 1). Moreover, he is obviously spoken of throughout chap. v as the actual son of Nabuchodonosor,[4] that is, of the monarch who is represented in Daniel and in Chronicles as having brought the golden vessels of Yahweh's temple into Babylonia. These historical statements, it is said, are not absolutely true to fact, and hence would not have been made by a contemporary of Nabuchodonosor and Cyrus. Nabuchodonosor was succeeded by his son Evil-Merodach (cfr. IV Kings xxv, 27), and he by the short-reigned Neriglissar and Laborosoarchod, after whom Nabonahid, a usurper unrelated to Nabuchodonosor, seized the throne. Nabonahid was the last king of the Chaldæans, and his son Belsharuzur, probably the same as the Baltassar of Daniel, is named on numerous Babylonian contract-tablets, but always by the title "the king's son," something like the modern "crown

[1] A. H. SAYCE, the Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments, p. 535.

[2] This is the case with E. PHILIPPE, art. Daniel (le Livre de), in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 1262.

[3] In this connection Fr. DELATTRE writes (Les Chaldéens, p. 28): "Un tel emploi du mot *Chasdim* serait étrange si tous les Babyloniens de ce temps avaient été Chaldéens; il se justifiè sans peine si l'on admet avec nous que les Chaldéens étaient une classe particulière et d'origine étrangère dans le peuple Babylonien." This remark seems to be groundless, seeing that the Babylonians as a nation are always called Chaldæans in the other books of the Old Test., and very particularly in Jeremias, a contemporary of the Exile.

[4] For a confirmation of this view, see Baruch i, 11.

Digitized by Google

prince." It seems, therefore, that however important a personage Baltassar was at the time of the fall of Babylon,—and indeed he was more active in the defence of his country than Nabonahid,—he was never king, and that neither he nor his father had any blood-relationship to Nabuchodonosor.[1]

Fourthly, "Darius the Mede," who is said in Daniel v, 31 "to have succeeded to the kingdom" of the Chaldæan Baltassar, is a ruler for whom there is apparently no room in history between Nabonahid and Cyrus. All other authorities, among which is found an account of the conquest of Babylon in contemporary records drawn up *by both the contending parties*, Nabonahid and Cyrus, bear witness that this conquest was the work of Cyrus.[2] It has indeed been conjectured that Darius was a viceroy appointed by that monarch. But this seems to be untenable. Darius is explicitly called "king" (vi, 4, 6, 9, etc.), described as an absolute ruler organizing the empire in 120 satrapies, and as no less truly king than Cyrus, in the following statement: "This Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian" (vi, 28). "Tradition, it can hardly be doubted, has here confused persons and events in reality distinct: 'Darius the Mede' must be a reflection into the past of Darius Hystaspis, who had to reconquer Babylon in B.C. 521, and again in 515, and who established the system of satrapies, combined, not impossibly, with indistinct recollections of Gubaru [Gobryas], who first occupied Babylon on Cyrus' behalf, and who, in appointing governors there, appears to have acted as Cyrus' deputy."[3]

Fifthly, the statement in Dan. ix, 2 to the effect that

[1] Cfr. SAYCE, loc. cit.; DRIVER, loc. cit.; Records of the Past, vol. v; etc.

[2] Cfr. SAYCE, loc. cit.. p. 528.

[3] DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 500; Daniel (in Cambridge Bible), p. lii sqq. See also, BEVAN, loc. cit., p. 19 sqq.; etc.

Digitized by Google

"Daniel understood by the[1] books the number of the years concerning which the word of Yahweh came to Jeremias the prophet, that seventy years shall be accomplished of the desolation of Jerusalem," points in the same direction. The expression "*the* books" can only be naturally understood as implying that the prophecies of Jeremias formed part of a well-known *collection* of sacred books,[2] which, nevertheless, it may be safely maintained, was not the case in the time of Nabuchodonosor and Cyrus.

Lastly, the following "improbabilities" are often pointed out as betraying an author later than Daniel's time: that a foreigner such as Daniel should have been accepted as their president by the wise men of Babylon (ii, 13, 48; iv, 9; v, 11, 12);[3] that Nabuchodonosor should condemn to death *all* the wise men of Babylon, Daniel and his companions included, although the skill of the latter four had not yet been tried (ii, 12, 13); that the same prince should have himself issued such a proclamation of his insanity as is recorded in chapter iv;[4] that the Jewish and theocratic flavor of the language in iii, 29; iv, 1 sq., and in vi, 26 sq., be truly referable to Nabuchodonosor and Darius respectively;[5] that Baltassar is represented in v, 11 as ignorant of Daniel, while the latter is spoken of (viii, 27) as doing the business of this king even in the third year of his reign; that lions should be described as dwelling in a dark pit or dungeon which could be closed from above like a cistern by a stone, and from which Daniel had afterwards to be taken up (cfr. vi, 7, 17, 23, 24).

It will be noticed that the foregoing arguments are drawn

[1] The article is found in the Hebrew Text.

[2] This is explicitly admitted by KNABENBAUER, in Danielem prophetam, p. 224.

[3] Lenormant felt this improbability so strongly that he regarded the passages where it is stated as later insertions.

[4] Notice particularly the change of person in iv, 28–30.

[5] Cfr. iv, 1–3; 34–37; vi, 25–27; and also ii, 47; iii, 93 sqq. (iii, 26 sqq. in the Hebrew Bible).

Digitized by Google

exclusively from the narrative part of the book of Daniel, and that they tend simply to show—on the basis of the unity of the work—that the writing reflects the traditions and historical impressions of an age considerably later than that of Nabuchodonosor and Cyrus. Now it is claimed that a close examination of the contents of the second part in the light of history compels us to bring down the composition of the book as it is found in our Hebrew Bible to a more definite date, viz., to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The *interest* of the visions in the second part of Daniel, in whatever way explained, culminates in the relations subsisting between the Jews and Antiochus. It is this prince who, as is admitted on all hands, is the subject of viii, 9–13, 23–25, and who, as already pointed out, is very probably "the little horn" spoken of in vii, 8, 20, 21, 25, while events of his reign are apparently described in ix, 25–27, and unquestionably so in the last vision of the book (cfr. xi, 21–45; xii, 6, 7, 10–12). Whence it is inferred that the book must belong to the period of Antiochus and the Machabees, according to the whole analogy of Scripture. The rule is that "even when the prophets of the Old Testament deliver a divine message for far distant days, they have in view the needs of the people of their own day. They rebuke *their* sins, they comfort *their* sorrows, they strengthen *their* hopes, they banish *their* fears. But of all this there is no trace in the book of Daniel, if it was written under Cyrus. Its message is avowedly for the time of the end, for the period of Antiochus and the Machabees. Our impression as to the Machabæan date of the work is strengthened when we observe how it is only in dealing with this period that the author is either accurate or detailed: for the period that precedes we have seen that he is often misinformed; and for the period that follows the year 165, with almost the single exception of his prediction

Digitized by Google

of the death of Antiochus, his language is vague and general."[1] This view is confirmed by the fact that the narratives themselves, when studied with reference to the events of Antiochus' reign, are found to impart lessons especially appropriate to the Jews of that period. "The question of eating meat (cfr. Dan. i) was at that time a test of faith. Then pious Jews 'chose to die that they might not be defiled with food and that they might not profane the covenant' (I Mach. i, 65 sq.) The lessons of the 'fiery furnace' and the 'lions' den' (chaps. iii, vi) never could have been more fitly presented than when 'there came out of Israel wicked men who persuaded many, saying: Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles that are around about us, (I Mach. i, 12), and when Antiochus commanded the worship of foreign deities on the pain of death (I Mach. i, 43–54). The stories of the humbling of Nabuchodonosor (Dan. iv) and the fall of Baltassar (v) would also be fraught with particular consolation when Israel was oppressed by the heathen."[2]

A last argument drawn from the contents of Daniel against the traditional view of the authorship consists in the theology of the book. In so far as the doctrinal ideas of the book have a distinctive character, they are said to point to an age later than the Exile, and a little earlier than the composition of the book of Enoch.[3] It is generally admitted that there is such a thing as a development of doctrine in the Old Testament, and that the religious ideas which come nearer to those of early Christianity arose proportionately late in the history of the Jewish Church. Now "it is undeniable that the conception of the future

[1] J. A. Selbie, in "the Critical Review," March 1902. Cfr. Driver, Daniel, p. lxv sq.

[2] E. L. Curtis, art. Daniel (the Book of), in Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 554.

[3] The book of Enoch was mostly compiled between 160 and 65 B.C.

Digitized by Google

kingdom of God, and the doctrines of angels, of the resurrection, and of the judgment of the world, appear in Daniel in a more developed form than elsewhere in the Old Testament, and exhibit features approximating to (though not identical with) those met in the book of Enoch. . . . The representation of the judgment upon heathen powers and of the manner in which the Divine kingdom is inaugurated upon earth (vii, 9–14, 26, 27) is unlike any other representation of the same facts contained in the Old Testament: let the reader study, for example, successively Amos ix, 9–15; Osee i, 10–ii, 1; xiv, 4–8; Isai. ii, 2–4; iv, 2–6; ix, 1–7; xi; xxviii, 18–24; xxix, 18–24; xxxii, 1–8; Jerem. xxiii, 1–8; xxxi; xxxiii; Ezech. xxxiv, 11–31; xxxvi; Isai. liv; lv; lx; and he can hardly fail to feel that when he comes to Daniel vii he is in a different circle of ideas. On the other hand, the representation of Daniel has many traits resembling those appearing shortly afterwards in the book of Enoch."[1] Again, "Angels have," in Daniel, "special personal names (viii, 16; ix, 21; x, 13, 21; xii, 1), special ranks (x, 13, 20; xii, 1), and the guardianship of different countries (x, 13, 20, 21).[2] These representations go far beyond those of Ezechiel and Zacharias, and are relatively identical with those of Tobias[3] and other Jewish writings of the first century B.C. Daniel plainly teaches a personal resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked (xii, 2). This also is a decided advance upon the doctrine elsewhere in the Old Testament.[4] . . . Thus, while the determination

[1] DRIVER, Daniel (Cambridge Bible), p. lxiv. The striking parallels between Daniel and the book of Enoch are carefully pointed out by R. H. CHARLES, the Book of Henoch. See also DRIVER, loc. cit., pp. 85 sq., 106 sq.; etc.

[2] The term "watcher" applied to the angels in the book of Enoch is found only in Daniel (iv 10, 14, 20) in the Old Testament.

[3] Concerning the date of the book of Tobias, see "Special Introd. to the Old Test.," part i, p. 341 sq., by the present writer.

[4] Cfr. valuable remarks on the Jewish belief in the Resurrection, in DRIVER's Daniel (Cambridge Bible), p. xc sqq.

Digitized by Google

of the date of an Old Testament writing from its religious doctrines is always a delicate procedure, yet, as far as a doctrinal development can be found in the Old Testament, the book of Daniel comes after all the other (proto-canonical) writings of the Old Testament, and approximates most closely to the Jewish literature of the first century B.C."[1]

Besides the arguments thus drawn from the contents of the book of Daniel, critics set forth the evidence of its language as decidedly opposed to the traditional view concerning its authorship. As previously stated (p. 361), the Hebrew of Daniel is of the distinctly late type which followed the age of Nehemias, and resembles most the language of Esther, Ecclesiastes, and especially Chronicles (about 300 B.C.).[2] It therefore points to a date much later than that of Nabuchodonosor and Cyrus. The same inference is no less certain from the foreign words which appear in both the Hebrew and Aramaic portions of Daniel. Instead of the many Babylonian words which one would naturally expect to find in a book which has been so long regarded as composed at Babylon in the sixth century B.C., a comparatively large number (some fifteen, at least) of Persian words[3] is met with. "It is remarkable that these are employed, not with any special reference to Persian affairs, but quite promiscuously. Thus in the list of King Nabuchodonosor's officials (iii, 2) we find two undoubtedly Persian titles. It must of course appear in itself highly improbable that

[1] E. L. CURTIS, loc. cit., p. 554. E. PHILIPPE'S remarks (in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, art. Daniel, col. 1265 sq.) to the contrary are very unsatisfactory.

[2] For details concerning the characteristic features of such late Hebrew, cfr DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of Old Test., pp. 505-508; A. A. BEVAN, the Book of Daniel, pp. 28-33. The *Aramaic* of Daniel should hardly be used as a proof of the lateness of the book, since it may well be supposed that it was not the original language of the book of Daniel. Concerning the principal features of that Aramaic, see DRIVER, BEVAN, loc cit.

[3] See the list given by DRIVER, Daniel, p. lvi; Literat. of Old Test., p 501.

Digitized by Google

Persian titles were then used at the Babylonian court. On the other hand, the long domination of the Achæmenidæ (thus called from Achæmenes, king of the Persians, ancestor of Cyrus) introduced Persian words into all the Aramaic-speaking countries, and not least into Palestine. Of these words many must have continued in use during the ages after Alexander, though as time went on and as intercourse with the remote East became less frequent, some of them fell into desuetude."[1] Nor is it less remarkable that, as pointed out by Sayce and Driver, the language of the numerous contract-tablets from Babylonia which belong to the age of Nabuchodonosor and his successors, and which represent the language of every-day commercial life, shows no trace of Persian admixture. For if the language of Babylonia was uninfluenced by Persia, much less would that of Israel at that same period be likely to be so influenced.[2] Besides, the book of Daniel contains at least three Greek words:[3] κίθαρις (in the form *githaros*), ψαλτήριον (in the form *psanterin*), and συμφωνία (in the form *sumponyah*). The first is indeed an ancient Greek word, found in Homer, and may possibly have found its way to Babylonia by the middle of the sixth century B.C. But it is not so with the second word, which occurs for the first time in Aristotle († 322 B.C.); nor with the third, which is met first in Plato († 347 B.C.). "These words, it may be confidently affirmed, could not have been used in the book of Daniel unless it had been written *after the dissemination of Greek influences in Asia through the conquests of Alexander the Great*" (B.C. 330).[4]

[1] BEVAN, loc cit. p. 40 sq.

[2] SAYCE, Higher Criticism and the Monuments, p. 493 sq.; DRIVER, loc. cit.

[3] This was formerly, but wrongly, denied by the defenders of the traditional view.

[4] DRIVER, Daniel p lix The συμφωνία is mentioned by Polybius († ab. 122 B.C.) as a favorite instrument with Antiochus Epiphanes (Polybius' text is quoted by BEVAN, loc. cit., p. 41, footn. 2).

Digitized by Google

As a confirmation of the arguments drawn from internal evidence, the opponents of the traditional view appeal to certain facts in the external history of the book of Daniel. It has already been mentioned that in the Palestinian Canon this book is reckoned not among "the Prophets," or second Canon of the Hebrew Bible, but in "the Writings" (the *Hagiographa*) or latest section of the sacred literature of the Jews of Palestine. Now the second Canon, or "the Prophets," was probably not closed till near B.C. 200. In any case it was certainly open after the third year of Cyrus (536 B.C.). How, then, does it come to pass that Daniel is not placed among them, although Aggeus, Zacharias, and Malachias, who were later than the time at which Daniel is described as living, are ranked among "the Prophets"? It has been said[1] that it was because Daniel was not a *professional* prophet, but only a person possessed of the prophetic gift, and so was excluded from the Prophets properly so called. But this supposition goes against the fact that Amos ranks among the prophetical writings, though he explicitly disclaims being a *professional* prophet (Amos vii, 14). Again, it has been surmised that before Talmudic times, to which our present Palestinian Canon would simply go back, the book of Daniel was really reckoned by the Jews among "the Prophets," and as a ground for this view Josephus' reckoning of the prophetical books to *thirteen* is appealed to.[2] This reasoning would be conclusive could it be shown that the Jewish historian, writing *Against Apion*, had in view the arrangement of the sacred books found in the Palestinian Canon of his time. But as he writes in Greek to Greeks, whom he could not assume to be acquainted with Hebrew, and as his own habit in the *Antiquities of the Jews*, a work previous to his controversial

[1] Cfr. TROCHON, Daniel, p. 48.
[2] E. PHILIPPE, art. Daniel, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 1262.

Digitized by Google

writing *Against Apion*, is to refer to the Septuagint Version, we may be sure that in the present treatise, directed against the learned Greeks of his time, he speaks of the sacred books of his race, as they were accessible to his Greek-speaking readers. In other words, he writes with reference to the arrangement of the sacred books as found in the Septuagint translation. In fact the book of Ecclesiasticus, written in Hebrew before Josephus' time, mentions in its enumeration of famous Israelites (Ecclus. xliv–l) the greater prophets Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and (collectively) the twelve minor prophets, without saying anything about Daniel. This certainly implies that the Hebrew Canon known to the author of Ecclesiasticus did not reckon the book of Daniel among "the Prophets." The most natural explanation of the exclusion of that book from the second Canon of the Jews of Palestine is therefore its late composition.

The same obvious reason is also given to explain other facts connected with the history of the book of Daniel; for instance: (1) the statement in Ecclesiasticus that no man was born upon earth "like unto Joseph" (xlix, 17), whereas the narratives respecting Daniel represent him much like unto Joseph in regard to both the high distinctions he attained and the faculties he displayed; and further, the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives in Genesis concerning Joseph;[1] (2) the absence of all traces of Daniel's influence upon the post-exilic literature anterior to the Machabæan period,[2] especially when it is contrasted with the distinct influence which such books as Jeremias exerted soon after their production.

"The *Conclusion*, then, in favor of the Machabæan date,

[1] Cfr. DRIVER, Daniel, p. 17 sqq., p. 64, etc.

[2] HENGSTENBERG, E. PHILIPPE, etc., are obliged to confess that of the "traces" which have sometimes been appealed to, none is really conclusive.

Digitized by Google

in view of this accumulation of concurrent facts, seems," it is said, "abundantly warranted. The exact date of composition is usually placed within the year B.C. 165. The 'abomination of desolation' (B.C. 168) is clearly before the writer, and also the Machabæan uprising in 167, but not the re-dedication of the Temple in December 165, and the death of Antiochus in 163 B C."[1]

Two main difficulties, however, are urged against this conclusion which, in the eyes of many, seems as yet very sweeping. First, it is objected that, in assigning the book of Daniel to so late a date, the predictive character of the second part (chaps. vii–xii) is done away with, although the visions therein contained are represented as revelations of the future given to Daniel during the Babylonian captivity. "But this difficulty vanishes," we are told, "the moment one considers how prevailing in the Old Testament and among Jewish writers was the custom of representing present messages as given in the past through ancient worthies. Thus the law in Deuteronomy is given as though spoken by Moses in the land of Moab, and the legislation of the Priestly Code (P) as though revealed to Moses in the wilderness. The book of Ecclesiastes is written as the experience of Solomon (and that of Wisdom was, as is granted on all hands, likewise composed by one impersonating the same monarch). While in the fourth book of Esdras, Baruch, the book of Enoch, and the Jewish apocalypses generally, this method of composition is abundantly illustrated, and was evidently a favorite one with the devout and pious of the centuries immediately preceding and following Christ."[2] Besides, it is argued that in admitting the year 165 B.C. for the composition of the book, "the author utters genuine predictions: at a moment when the national peril was great

[1] E. L CURTIS. art. Daniel (the Book of), in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 5:4; DRIVER, Daniel, p. lxvi sq.

[2] E. L. CURTIS, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

and the very existence of the nation was threatened (I Mach. iii, 35, 36) he comes forward with words of consolation and hope, assuring his faithful compatriots that the future, like the past and the present, is part of God's predetermined plan, and that within less than 3½ years of the time at which he speaks their persecutor will be no more and the period of their trial will be past. This prediction is exactly on a footing with those of the earlier prophets —of Isaias, for instance, who says (viii, 4) that before a child just born can cry Father, and Mother, Damascus will be taken by the king of Assyria; who declares (xvi, 14; xxi, 16) that within three years the glory of Moab, and within one year the glory of Cedar, will both be humbled; and who announces the deliverance of Jerusalem (xxix, 1–5) within a year from the siege and distress which he sees impending; or of the great prophet of the Exile, who, as Cyrus is advancing on his career of conquest (Isai. xli, 2, 3, 25), bids his people not be in alarm (xli, 8–11, etc.), the successes of Cyrus are part of God's providential plan (xli, 2, 4, 25) and will issue in the deliverance of Israel from exile (xliv, 28; xlv, 4, 13)."[1]

The second difficulty is drawn from the historical character of the first part of Daniel, for chaps. i–vi read like strictly historical narratives. This difficulty, as might well be supposed, has received various answers. Perhaps the best is that given by J. A. Selbie,[2] in the following terms: "Even if we should have to adopt the conclusion that there is no firm historical basis for the incidents recorded in the first six chapters, the book would not be thereby robbed of its value for edification[3] But, on the other hand, we have

[1] Driver, Daniel, p. lxvii.

[2] J. A. Selbie, art. Critical Opinion on the Book of Daniel, in "the Critical Review," March 1902, p. 111 sq. See also E. L. Curtis, loc. cit., p. 555; Driver, loc. cit., p. lxviii sq.

[3] Cfr. remarks on parallel cases in "Special Introd. to the Old Test.," part i, p. 344 sqq, by the present writer.

Digitized by Google

no reason to conclude that the *whole* story of Daniel was invented by the writer. There appears to us to be a close analogy between the book of Daniel and the book of Job. Recent investigations have rendered it extremely probable that a popular book of Job preceded the present highly dramatical work. The folk-lore of Israel told of a Job whose trials were as severe as his patience was unique. In like manner the author of the book of Daniel was probably acquainted with oral traditions regarding an ancient sage and hero of the name of Daniel ; nay, he may possibly even have had at his command a written source which told of this Daniel's wisdom and of his fidelity to God under very trying circumstances. In short, to put it plainly, if any one feels that as yet his faith would be seriously shaken if the story of the lions' den and the fiery furnace had to be given up, he is perfectly entitled, for aught that criticism can prove to the contrary, to hold to these narratives as *essentially true*, although there is no doubt, as we have seen, that the historical setting of them is incorrect. That is a safe halting-place meanwhile, but it is safer still to aim at a faith which will be independent of such support, and to discover a permanent value in the book, even if its historical basis should prove extremely slender. . . . If Dives and Lazarus and the Good Samaritan appeal to us as powerfully as if the incidents recorded of them had actually occurred, why should Daniel lose its moral influence if the narratives concerning him should have to be relegated to the realm of edifying *Haggada?*[1] Or, to put it still more plainly, if fiction is a legitimate vehicle for conveying a moral lesson outside Scripture, is its use forbidden within it? Or may we conclude that God, who of old time spoke by divers portions and in divers manners, who found a place in His

[1] Concerning the *Haggada*, see the present writer's "General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," p. 407.

Digitized by Google

Word for allegory and parable, and fable and drama, did not disdain to employ this literary device as well? . . . Are we to ignore a writer's purpose and miss the lessons he teaches because the literary form he employs, and which is now found to have been common when he lived, is not what tradition had taught us to expect?"

Although the considerable value of these answers to the difficulties urged against the late composition of Daniel can hardly be denied, since similar positions have been endorsed by the vast majority of scholars—even by some Catholic writers—in connection with other books of Holy Writ, and although the admission of the late date of Daniel would not be inconsistent with any article of the faith,[1] yet Catholic writers generally are reluctant to depart from the time-honored "opinion"[2] that Daniel is the author of the book which bears his name.

§ 3. *The Deutero-Canonical Parts of the Book of Daniel.*

1. Contents, and Place in the Septuagint, in the Vulgate. Besides the proto-canonical portions of the book of Daniel which are found in the Hebrew Bible, the Greek translations of Daniel (Septuagint and Theodotion) and the Latin Vulgate, together with some other derived translations, contain several important parts which are deutero-canonical.[3] They are: (1) the Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children; (2) the History of Susanna;

[1] In this reference Card. NEWMAN's words deserve to be quoted: "The Chaldee and Greek portions of the book of Daniel, even though not written by Daniel, may be, and we believe are, written by penmen inspired in matters of faith and morals; and so much, and nothing beyond, does the Church 'oblige' us to believe" (Art. on the Inspiration of Scripture, p. 195)

[2] So is the traditional view called by Abbé H. RAULT, Cours Elémentaire d'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p 303 (4th edit.). In 1882 Fr. Rault's work was used as a text-book in thirty-three French theological seminaries.

[3] With regard to their sacred and canonical character, see the present writer's "General Introd. to the Study of the Holy Scriptures," part i, Biblical Canonics.

Digitized by Google

and (3) the History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon.

The first of these fragments, as might be expected from the nature of its contents, is usually inserted in the third chapter between the 23d and the 24th verses.[1] It consists of a prayer in which Azarias, standing in the midst of the furnace, asks that God may deliver him and his companions and put their enemies to shame (verses 24–45); a brief notice of the fact that the Angel of the Lord saved the three holy children from all harm, although the fearful flame consumed the Chaldæans above the furnace (verses 46–50); and a canticle of praise to God from the three children together (verses 51–90).

The History of Susanna is found at the end of the book in the LXX and the Vulgate (as chap. xiii), before Bel and the Dragon (chap. xiv). It recounts how Susanna, the faithful wife of a wealthy Jew named Joakim and resident in Babylon, was falsely accused of adultery by two unworthy elders whose advances she had repelled. They declared they had caught her in the act, and, their testimony having been accepted without inquiry by the tribunal before which Susanna had been arraigned, she was forthwith condemned to death. As she was led forth to execution, a young boy among the bystanders, named Daniel, was moved by God to declare her innocent, and he loudly remonstrated with the people upon allowing without sufficient inquiry the condemnation of a daughter of Israel. Intrusted with conducting the new inquiry himself, Daniel examined the two elders separately, and easily proved their testimony to be self-contradictory. Whereupon the law of Moses (Deut. xix, 19) was applied to them: they were put to death; "and Daniel became great in the sight of the people from that day onwards."

[1] In the Alexandrinus Codex it is placed after the *Psalms*, in the form of *Hymns* ix and x.

Digitized by Google

The third deutero-canonical part of Daniel is the History of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon. In the LXX and the Vulgate it stands as the last chapter of the book (chap. xiv), whereas in the MSS. of Theodotion it is attached to the History of Susanna, which is itself placed at the beginning of the book. In the Septuagint it bears the strange title: "From the prophecy of Habacuc, son of Jesus, of the tribe of Levi," and its opening verse reads as follows: "There was a certain priest whose name was Daniel, son of Abal, who was on familiar terms with the king of Babylon." In Theodotion's version that strange title gives place to the following historical statement concerning the Babylonian king who is not named in the Septuagint: "And King Astyages was gathered to his fathers, and Cyrus the Persian received his kingdom,"[1] so that the scene of the destruction of Bel and the Dragon is apparently laid in Babylon, shortly after the accession of Cyrus, with whom it is said that "Daniel lived on familiar terms and was honored above all his friends" (Vulg. xiv. 1). The Babylonians had an idol called Bel, who, as they supposed, consumed during the night daily large offerings of fine flour, sheep, and wine. Daniel, being asked by Cyrus why he did not worship Bel, answered that "he did not worship idols made with hands, but the living God." The king replied that Bel was certainly a living god, since he consumed regularly so much food. Whereupon Daniel undertook to undeceive him. The usual supply of food was placed before the idol; but before the door of the temple was finally locked, Daniel had the floor strewn within with ashes. "The priests went

[1] The Greek translation, from which the Vulgate derived these deutero-canonical parts of Daniel, is not that of the Septuagint, which was viewed with disfavor by the early Christian Church, but the more liberal version of Theodotion. The historical statement concerning the accession of Cyrus is therefore found in the Vulgate. It does not appear, however, in it as chapter xiv, 1, but as the last verse of chap. xiii In regard to the exegetical difficulties connected with that historical statement, see TROCHON, Daniel, p. 264

Digitized by Google

in by night, according to their custom, with their wives and their children: and they ate and drank up all."[1] The next morning, when the door was opened, the king triumphantly pointed to the empty table. But Daniel having shown him the marks of the footsteps on the floor, the monarch saw that he had been duped, caused the priests to be put to death, and allowed Daniel to destroy Bel and his temple. There was also a great dragon in Babylon who was worshipped as a god, and whom Cyrus pointed to Daniel as indeed "a living god."[2] Thus challenged, Daniel gave to the dragon a food which caused him to die. The people, enraged with what had happened, terrified the king into delivering Daniel into their hands, and he was cast into a lions' den. While he was there the prophet Habacuc, at the time when he was carrying food to his reapers at his home in Juda, was miraculously transported to Babylon to provide Daniel with a repast. Upon the seventh day the king went to the den to bewail Daniel; but finding him alive in the midst of the lions, he praised aloud the power of the God of Daniel, and delivered those who would have destroyed that prophet to the same fate.

2. Original Language. It is not easy, at the present day, to define in what language the deutero-canonical parts of Daniel were originally written. The mere fact that they have come down to us through two Greek translations (the LXX and Theodotion) of that prophetic writing does not prove conclusively that they, like the rest of the book, were rendered into Greek from a Hebrew or Aramaic original;[3] and the literary features exhibited by these Greek documents are not such as to point unquestionably either to

[1] Dan. xiv, 14.

[2] Dan. xiv, 23.

[3] The Septuagint contains books primitively written in Greek; Wisdom, II Machabees, for example.

Digitized by Google

Greek or to Aramaic as the primitive language of the deutero-canonical parts themselves. The following reasons, however, make it more probable that they were originally written, not in Greek, but either in Hebrew or in Aramaic.

I. The first fragment, which contains the *Prayer of Azarias* and the *Song of the Three Children*, is intimately connected with, or rather reads like an integrant part of, Daniel iii (verses 23 and 91 sqq. presuppose the intercalary deutero-canonical verses), and on that account may well be regarded as having been composed in the same language—either Hebrew or Aramaic—as the rest of the chapter. Again, this first fragment is strongly Hebraistic in its diction;[1] and the fact that it is found in the version of Theodotion, the text of which presents important and numerous variations from that of the Septuagint, seems likewise to point to a Hebrew or Aramaic original, which was more or less independently rendered into Greek by Theodotion and by the Septuagint translator of Daniel.

II. The *History of Susanna*, like the first deutero-canonical fragment, is found in Theodotion under a form which differs considerably in point of language and text from that which is embodied in the Septuagint Version. Hence it may also be inferred that these two Greek translations of Daniel represent direct renderings from a Hebrew or Aramaic original. Both Greek versions are characterized by distinct Hebraisms, and were it not for the play upon Greek words in verses 54 and 55 respectively (σχῖνον . . . σκίσει), and in verses 58 and 59 (πρῖνον . . . πρίσει), very few scholars would hesitate in regarding Hebrew or Aramaic as the primitive language of that second deutero-canonical fragment.[2]

[1] Cfr. TROCHON, Daniel; KNABENBAUER, in Danielem prophetam; Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd., vol. iii, p. 227 sq ; JAHN, Introd., p. 505.

[2] This difficulty is distinctly rejected by Franz DELITZSCH, who says: "Ejusmodi paronomasias in linguis Semiticis facillimas esse, Arabica quoque Susannæ versio

Digitized by Google

III. In regard to the last deutero-canonical piece which is made of the two stories of the destruction of Bel and of that of the Dragon, Prof. H. E. Ryle significantly remarks:[1] "Most scholars, from Eichhorn to König, have considered the original language of these stories to be Greek; but Gaster's discovery (of an ancient Aramaic text of the story of the *Dragon* in the *Chronicles of Jerameel*) looks strongly, if not decisively, in favor of Aramaic. The confusion of זעפא (storm-wind) and זיפא (pitch) points in the same direction. . . . Besides, many divergent parallel readings yield, when translated, very similar Aramaic words."

3. Difficulties concerning Authorship. The view just propounded, that the deutero-canonical fragments of Daniel were not originally written in Greek, makes it indeed easier to suppose that they were from the beginning integrant parts of the book. But it does not settle the question of their date and authorship. Such conservative writers as Vigouroux, Gilly, and others, while admitting a Hebrew or Aramaic original for the History of Susanna, and for that of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon, think that these two fragments are probably from a different author than the rest of the book.[2] As regards the Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children, they agree with nearly all Catholic scholars in referring them to the time of Daniel, if not to that prophet himself.[3] In reality there are considerable difficulties in admitting such an early date for any of the deutero-canonical parts of the prophecy of Daniel, even granting that the proto-canonical parts belong to that period.

ostendit. Ergo nihili est argumentum inde petitum." The plays on words may be due to the Greek translator.

[1] H. E. Ryle, art. Bel and the Dragon, in Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 268.

[2] Cfr. Vigouroux, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1054; Gilly, Précis d'Introduction, vol. iii, p. 148.

[3] Cfr. H. Lesêtre, Manuel d'Introduction à l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 626.

Digitized by Google

I. It is of course possible to interpret all the passages in the Prayer of Azarias (Dan. iii, 24–45) in such a way as to make them refer to the circumstances of the Babylonian captivity. The general tone, however, of that Prayer, which on the one hand deals so little with the actual condition of Azarias and his companions in the furnace, and which on the other hand—especially by its transparent allusions to Antiochus[1] and the apostate Jews[2] of his time (verse 32), to the lamentable condition of the Jews persecuted for their faith and deprived of both king and prophet (verses 37, 38)—seems to describe the general condition of the Jewish people in the well-known period of the Machabees, goes far toward proving that this part of the first deutero-canonical fragment is of a writer posterior to the time of Daniel. In like manner the straightforward understanding of verse 53 in the Song of the Three Children, with its manifest reference to the Holy Temple of Jerusalem,[3] produces upon one the impression that at the time when the Canticle was composed the Temple was standing, which was not the case at the time of the Exile.

II. Similar difficulties have been urged against assigning an early date to the History of Susanna. As far back as Julius Africanus[4] it was felt that there is something rather theatrical in the representation of the scene of the conviction of the two elders; that it is not likely that in the early years of the Exile, i.e. at the time when the fact narrated is supposed to have occurred, the Jews had so much power delegated to them as to pass sentence of death on the wife

[1] Every unbiassed reader will readily admit that the terms of verse 32: "King unjust and most wicked beyond all that are upon the earth," apply better to Antiochus than to Nabuchodonosor.

[2] To escape from this natural inference TROCHON chooses to regard the present Greek reading concerning the apostate Jews as an error of copyists (Daniel, p. 124).

[3] Even TROCHON (p. 128) thus interprets Dan. iii. 53.

[4] See his letter to Origen in the Collection of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. iv (Amer. edit.).

Digitized by Google

of their *king*, Joakim; or if it was not this Joakim, but some other from the common people, that the circumstances of one so recently made captive should be described as of one possessing a large mansion and spacious garden; that the work was not to be found in connection with that book of Daniel which was received by the Jews; that the style is different from that of the book. Besides these ancient difficulties, "attention has been recently called by various critics to the disorderly way in which the civil trial here described was conducted; to the hasty manner in which the condemnation was pronounced on the testimony of two persons, without opportunity being allowed for evidence in rebuttal, or any further examination of the case whatsoever; . . . to the general inconsistency of the character of Daniel as here depicted with that of the historic Daniel; . . . to the incredible supposition that Daniel is able, notwithstanding his youthfulness, to reverse, by a word, a solemn judicial decision of the Sanhedrin."[1]

For these and other such reasons the composition of the History of Susanna has been ascribed to several writers besides the prophet Daniel.[2] Thus Eusebius († ab. 338), Apollinaris († ab. 382), and St. Jerome († 420) have regarded Habacuc as its author; while others,[3] in more recent times have thought that a Jew, now unknown, is its writer. Prof. Driver, in his valuable commentary on Daniel,[4] speaks of the first century B.C. as the probable date of this incident, as also of the other deutero-canonical fragments of the book. And there is no doubt that whoever regards the

[1] E. C. Bissell, the Apocrypha of the Old Test., in Lange-Schaff, Comm. on the Holy Scriptures, p. 446.

[2] According to Calmet, Danko, Zschokke, Rault, Cornely, Lesêtre, etc., Daniel is the author of the History of Susanna.

[3] Among them may be mentioned Cornelius à Lapide, S.J., Reusch; Gilly; Vigouroux.

[4] Daniel, in the Cambridge Bible, p. xxi.

Digitized by Google

prophecy of Daniel as having been written about the middle of the second century before our era, on account of its various anachronisms, should for that reason feel obliged to refer to the same, or about the same, date (160 B.C.) the composition of the History of Susanna.

III. Among the difficulties which have been made against the twofold episode of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon, the following are those which are most insisted upon: 1. the worship of *living* serpents in Babylon, which, it is claimed, "is in direct opposition to what is known to have been true of the religious rites of the Babylonians and Persians";[1] 2. the destruction of the statue of Bel, which occurred, as it seems, not during the reign of Cyrus, but under Xerxes (B.C. 479), as recorded by Herodotus (History, book i, chap. 183); 3. the peculiar tone of familiarity between Cyrus and Daniel which runs through the History of Bel and the Dragon (cfr. verses 3, 6, 15, 18, 23), and which is in striking contrast with the tone of respect naturally due to the Persian monarch, and no less naturally reflected in the *parallel* account of Dan. vi; 4. the fact that in the Septuagint Text Daniel is called a priest and yet confounded with the prophet Daniel, and that the whole history of the Destruction of Bel and the Dragon is ascribed to the prophet Habacuc.

It is chiefly on account of the ascription of that fragment by the LXX to Habacuc that ancient scholars, such as Eusebius, Apollinaris, and others, have rejected the Danielic authorship. Very recently Vigouroux[2] has admitted that Daniel xiv was written by one different from the author of the first twelve chapters of the book, and Abbé Gilly has significantly remarked: "Perhaps these episodes were composed by a contemporary of Daniel, or by a later writer on

[1] E. C. BISSELL, loc. cit., p. 447; see also p 463.
[2] Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1054.

Digitized by Google

the basis of oral traditions."[1] It can hardly be doubted, that the supposition of a late authorship,—about 160 B.C.,—"on the basis of oral traditions," is best in harmony with an unbiassed study of the various features of this last deutero-canonical section.

[1] GILLY, loc. cit., p. 165.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XV.

THE MINOR PROPHETS OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY B.C.: AMOS, OSEE, AND MICHEAS.

I. ISRAEL AND JUDA DURING THE EIGHTH CENTURY B.C.

II. THE PROPHET AMOS:

1. His Name and Personal History.
2. Contents of His Book:
   - Poetical Arrangement (How Recognized).
   - Chief Parts and Leading Ideas.
3. Unity, Date. and Authorship (Grounds for Recent Theory of a Post-Exilic Date).

III. THE PROPHET OSEE:

1. Name and Life of the Prophet.
2. Contents of His Book:
   - Narrative Character of the First Part (i–iii).
   - Second Part (iv–xiv).
     - Strophical Arrangement admitted.
     - Leading Ideas Pointed out.
3. Authorship, Integrity and Text of the Book of Osee.

IV. THE PROPHET MICHEAS:

1. His Name and Personal History.
2. Contents of His Book:
   - Difficulty in Distributing the Contents.
   - Chief Parts Indicated.
3. Date and Authorship of his Prophecy.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XV.

THE MINOR PROPHETS OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY B.C.: AMOS, OSEE, AND MICHEAS.

§ 1. *Israel and Juda during the Eighth Century B.C.*

The collection or "book" of the Twelve Minor Prophets[1] opens in the Septuagint and the Old Latin Versions with the prophecies of Amos, Osee, and Micheas[2] These three books are usually referred to the eighth century B.C. In fact their titles mention only monarchs of that period, to wit, Osias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias, kings of Juda, and Jeroboam, the son of Joas, king of Israel, as the rulers under whom the utterances of these earlier minor prophets were delivered. It is therefore natural to preface a study of Amos, Osee, and Micheas with a brief sketch of the condition of the Jews during the eighth century B.C.

Israel, or the Northern Jewish Kingdom of the time, was exceedingly prosperous under the long and skilful management of Jeroboam, the son of Joas (Jeroboam II.). At his accession (781 B.C.)[3] this prince found Israel fast recovering from its wearisome and disastrous struggle in the preceding century with the neighboring kingdom of Syria. Joas, his father, had availed himself of the gradual weaken-

[1] The Jews have always regarded the collection of "the Twelve" as *one* canonical book (cfr. H. B. SWETE, Introd. to the Old Test. in Greek, p. 200 sqq.).

[2] In the Hebrew Text, and in the Vulgate which follows the Jewish lists, the first three minor prophets are Osee, Joel, Amos.

[3] The dates of the period before the capture of Samaria (721 B.C.) are only approximative.

Digitized by Google

ing of that country under the hostile inroads of Assyria to reconquer the cities east of the Jordan, which Israel had lost in the conflict.[1] He had also, in an imbroglio with Juda, made the Southern tributary to the Northern kingdom.[2] Finally, toward the end of his reign, it had been given him to witness the beginning of a momentary decline of the power and prestige of Assyria. All these were so many opportunities of which Jeroboam II. made the most during his long reign of at least forty years. Scarcely had he acceded to the throne of Israel when he carried the war into Syria itself, and even succeeded in capturing Damascus, its capital. He next turned his arms against Moab and Ammon and conquered their territory. Nor did he neglect to preserve Israel's suzerainty over the kingdom of Juda. So that, a comparatively short time after Jeroboam's accession, Israel had regained the position which it had enjoyed for a brief space after the conquests of David: its dominion extended from the Nile to the Euphrates.

Peace and security naturally followed on this territorial extension of Israel, and together with them a rapid artistic and commercial development set in. Under this glitter of prosperity, however, significant traces of social and moral decay could easily be detected. "The simplicity of pastoral and agricultural life had given way and vanished before the usual social and economic effects of long-continued warfare. The small landholders had been utterly impoverished and were fast sinking into abject distress and even slavery. The rich accumulated large tracts of land in their own hands, while the reckless extravagance of the court and aristocracy exhausted the national resources. On the other hand, the mercantile spirit had received a great impetus from the recent wars. The sins of a growing and

[1] Cfr. IV Kings xiii. 25.
[2] Cfr. IV Kings xiv, 8 sqq.

Digitized by Google

insolent middle class began to make their appearance, especially gross dishonesty in trade and harshness in the exaction of debts. The gulf between class and class became daily wider and more menacing, while the social miseries of the time were embittered by the inveterate curse of Oriental life, viz., venality and corruption in the administration of justice. Thus the oppressed classes were left without hope and without redress."[1]

Very ominous, too, was the sad condition of religion in Israel at that time. Not only continued national success abroad and prevalent material prosperity at home were popularly regarded as assured signs of divine favor; but the mere maintenance of a stately *cultus* was generally considered as the all-sufficient means of keeping Yahweh's good will toward the people of His choice. With this end in view crowds of worshippers thronged, from time to time, the various sanctuaries of Israel, especially that of Bethel, where the court was located, and offered costly sacrifices, unmindful of those inward feelings wherewith they should have accompanied such offerings to make them acceptable to a thrice-holy God. Yea, more: too often were these sacred feasts transformed into special occasions for self-satisfied enjoyment and tumultuous revelry. "Again, the freer intercourse of Israel with heathen nations, who had either been conquered or were distinguished by commerce and art, together with the general looseness and intemperance of life, caused an extensive introduction of heathen religions."[2]

These various causes of public decline and corruption were indeed at work during most of the reign of Jeroboam II., but it is only in the latter part of his rule that, after having gradually grown in intensity, they resulted in a

[1] R. L. Ottley, The Hebrew Prophets, p. 18 sq.
[2] Ewald, History of Israel, vol. iv, p. 126 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

generally prevalent drunkenness, debauchery, and idolatry. And yet it was at that very time that Israel should have been frugal, abstemious, and faithful to its God. Assyria was then starting on a new series of Western conquests, and a conflict between her forces and those of Israel was bound to occur in near future.

"After the death of Jeroboam II. the kingdom of Israel, repeatedly invaded by Assyrian troops, hastened to its ruin under the rule of murderers and profligates. His son and successor, Zacharias, was murdered after a reign of only six months. His murderer, Sellum, had occupied the throne only one month, when he met with the same fate at the hands of one Manahem, who came from Thersa, and who, after having committed the most revolting cruelties against his opponents, reigned ten years in Samaria. His son and successor, Phaceia, reigned but two years, after which he was slain by Phacee, one of his captains. Phacee occupied the throne for the comparatively long period of twenty years, but was at length put to death by Osee, the nineteenth and last king of Israel." The Northern Kingdom was overthrown by Salmanasar IV. in 721 B.C.[1]

The history of Juda, or the Southern Kingdom, during the eighth century B.C. has already been sketched in connection with the Life and Times of Isaias,[2] so that it needs not to be repeated.

§ 2. *The Prophet Amos.*

1. His Name and Personal History. The name of the prophet Amos occurs nowhere in the Old Testament except in Tobias ii, 6, and in his own book (i, 1, 7, 8, sqq.; viii, 2). It is true that several ecclesiastical writers have

[1] "Outlines of Jewish History," by the present writer, p. 252 sq.

[2] Cfr. Chapter X of the present volume. For further information, see "Outlines of Jewish History," pp 261-265.

Digitized by Google

regarded it as identical with the name of the father of Isaias. But, as was noted in connection with the latter prophet, this identification was due to their ignorance of Hebrew, in which language the two names are spelled differently.[1] This very limited use of the minor prophet's name helps to account for the fact that the meanings which have been attached to it by scholars, such as "one who bears a load," "the people who is torn asunder," "stammerer," "borne" (by God), are so very divergent.

Amos belonged to the Southern Kingdom, and the heading of his book (chap. i, 1) names the village of Thecua, some six miles south of Bethlehem, as his home. Thecua was apparently a shepherds' town, and Amos is represented as one who owned a flock of stunted sheep, valuable for their fine wool.[2] As he pastured them in the neighborhood of his native place, he had below him the mass of the desert hills, from the contemplation of which he would gain the sense of natural grandeur which seems to be reflected in his work.[3] "Not far off, too, he would meet with the caravans of the Dedanites (Isai. xxi, 13) and other Arabian peoples, and would imbibe from them a longing to see other men and manners. Possibly, too, such an idiom as: 'with the capture of your horses' (Amos iv, 10) may be explained from Arabian influence."[4] Besides, "he was not tied down to the soil, and may before his prophetical mission to Samaria have wandered, either on business or from curiosity, far away from home, and have seen and heard much of which his neighbors were ignorant. To suppose this is not to deny that even the stayer-at-home had opportunities

[1] The spelling of the minor prophet's name is 'Amos, that of the father of Isaias 'Am. ç.

[2] Cfr. Amos i, 1; vii, 14. In the latter passage (vii, 14) he is also spoken of as a "sycamore grower."

[3] Cfr. George A. Smith, the Historical Geography of the Holy Land, p. 315.

[4] T. K. Cheyne, art. Amos, in the Encyclop. Biblica, vol. i, col. 148.

Digitized by Google

of hearing news, but to try to understand the alertness of Amos' intellect, the width of his knowledge, and the striking culture and refinement of his style. At any rate, it is plain that he studied thoroughly, on the spot, the condition of life and thought in the Northern Kingdom, and we must regret that we have no further contemporary traditions respecting him than that contained in vii, 10–17."[1]

However this may be, it is beyond doubt that Amos did not frequent the prophetical schools of Israel, for he himself declares that he was "not the son of a prophet."[2] It was from following his flock in the wilderness of Juda that Yahweh took him for a special mission, saying: "Go, prophesy to My people, Israel."[3] The divine summons directed him to deliver to the nation, and more particularly to its leaders, a message of judgment, and its carrying out would naturally entail many dangers. Yet Yahweh's call was so imperative, and the denunciation of future judgment so badly needed in Israel, that no room was left for hesitation in Amos' mind.[4] The prosperous reign of Jeroboam II., now near its close, had long accustomed the Northern Kingdom to peace and security, and Israel felt confident that, despite the nation's prevalent corruption, Yahweh would pronounce in their favor should Assyria, whose Western expeditions were again rumored about, threaten the possessions of His chosen people. It was Amos' mission to undeceive Israel, and he entered upon it with all the more earnestness because, while sent to point out to the northern tribes the abyss to which they were hastening, he had but

[1] CHEYNE, loc. cit. Cfr. Prof. Jas. ROBERTSON, the Early Religion of Israel. 3d edit., note xxiii, p. 510.

[2] Amos vii, 14. Concerning the *Schools of the Prophets*, see the present writer's "Outlines of Jewish History," p. 276.

[3] Amos vii, 15.

[4] Cfr. Amos iii, 3–8, and W. R. SMITH, the Prophets of Israel, p. 121 sq. (New York, 1882).

Digitized by Google

little time at his disposal to urge them to repentance.[1] As he went along announcing swift impending judgment on Israel because of its sin, unfavorable reports spread of the new prophet of evil. But it is particularly his preaching in Bethel which seems to have aroused fears and provoked opposition. Amasias, the chief priest of the royal sanctuary, sent a message to Jeroboam, depicting him as a man dangerous for the safety of both king and state, and at the same time ordered Amos to withdraw to Juda. Then it was that the prophet disclaimed any official and permanent standing as a divine messenger, and completed his own message to Israel. He retired home unmolested, and there wrote the substance of his speeches.[2]

2. Contents of the Book of Amos. It is not to be supposed that the discourses of Amos were delivered exactly as they are recorded. This view is precluded by the allusions to the prophet's experience in Israel in ii, 12; v, 10, 13, and also by the elaborate literary character of the work. The simplicity of the style is that of the highest art, and its abrupt short clauses are linked together by the closest parallelism.[3] In fact it is plain that throughout the book the topics are treated poetically. Sections corresponding to each other in language and in progress of thought can be easily made out (compare, for example, i, 3–5 with i, 6–8; vii, 1–3 with vii, 4–6). Strophes having a definite

[1] Amos' mission was but a temporary one; hence he speaks of himself as not being "a prophet" (vii, 14), that is, as not being intrusted permanently with the prophetical office. His mission extended apparently from two years before to a few years after an earthquake, the exact date of which is unknown (cfr. Amos i, 1). See also ORELLI, the Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 104 (Engl. Transl.).

[2] Very late and untrustworthy legends, traces of which are still found in the Roman martyrology (March 31st), tell of Amos' martyrdom under the ill treatment of Amasias and his son (cfr. TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 133; E. PHILIPPE, art. Amos, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 512; etc.).

[3] Cfr. art. *Amos*, in the Encyclop. Britannica, 9th edit. The Hebrew parallelism prevails even in Amos vii, 10–17, which is often taken as a piece of historical prose (cfr. W. R. HARPER, the "Biblical World," Nov. 1898, p. 334).

Digitized by Google

number of lines, with opening and concluding set formulas, characteristic expressions in the development of the thoughts, trimeter or tetrameter movement of the lines, etc., can also be recognized. These and other such poetical features which have been pointed out by recent Biblical scholars—among whom may be mentioned Prof. W. R. Harper (in "the Biblical World," Aug., Sept., Oct., Nov. 1898) and Father A. Condamin, S.J. (in "La Revue Biblique," July 1901)—go far toward proving that the prophecy of Amos, in its present form, differs considerably from his spoken oracles.

As with respect to the form, so also most likely in point of contents, the oral utterances of Amos underwent changes when they were committed to writing. Numerous details having a direct reference to the concrete circumstances of time, place, persons, etc., and on that account most natural on the lips of such an earnest speaker as Amos, were omitted at the time of writing: some because they did not seem to have any permanent interest; others, perhaps, because they had already faded from the writer's memory. Other details, on the contrary, such as further developments of an idea or allusions to events subsequent to the delivery of his oracles, would readily be added, either because naturally suggested by a theme in hand or because referring to facts familiar to all at the time of writing. In some such way the written prophecies of Amos were made to differ from his oral utterances, as much as the second edition of Jeremias' prophecies varied from the first which had been destroyed by King Joakim.[1] In this connection, Father R. Cornely, S.J., pertinently writes: "In libello hoc, Amos non integros suos sermones nobis reliquit, sed summa eorum capita novo et apto ordine disposita."[2]

[1] Cfr. Jeremias xxxvi. See also Chapter XII of the present volume.

[2] R. Cornely, Historica et Critica Introd. in U. T. Libros Sacros, vol. ii, part ii, p. 547.

Digitized by Google

As it now stands, the book of Amos is usually divided into three sections. The first opens with a general title to the work (i, 1) and a text or motto in four poetical lines (verse 2). It comprises the first two chapters and is made up of a series of oracles against Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Edom, Ammon, Moab, and Juda, culminating in a similar denunciation of Israel. "The Northern Kingdom has sinned grievously, treating the poor and needy unjustly and oppressing them beyond all measure, until their behavior has become in the eyes of the world a profanation of Yahweh's holy name. This immoral condition is due to no lack of effort or knowledge on Yahweh's part, since He had led Israel out of Egypt, and had driven the Chanaanites before them, and had given teachers who should declare righteousness to them: but all His care had been without result. For her sins Israel must suffer. The nation shall perish. No one, not even the swiftest and strongest, shall escape."[1]

The second section (chaps. iii–vi) consists in a series of addresses which expand the indictment and sentence against Israel described in ii, 6–16. In iii, 1–8 the prophet enlarges upon the coming ruin of the Northern Kingdom, and in iii, 9–iv, 3 describes in a particular manner the doom of its capital city. On account of its extreme wickedness, Samaria will be quickly and entirely laid waste by a foreign enemy; even its women, because of their debaucheries, shall be carried captives through breaches in the walls. The prophet next asks the people ironically whether their pompous ritual which they delight to carry out has saved them from the various chastisements which he enumerates, and he bids them to prepare for God's judgment (iv, 4–13). This is followed by a dirge announcing Israel's coming

[1] W. R. HARPER, in "the Biblical World," Sept. 1898, p. 180, footn. 8. For a somewhat different view of the contents of this first section, cfr. DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 314 sq.

Digitized by Google

destruction (v, 1–9), and by a poem describing how the various transgressors shall come to grief unless, indeed, giving up their evil ways, they shall turn to the God of Hosts (v, 10–17). Lastly comes a poem (v, 18–vi) which sets forth the Doom of Captivity, and "consists of three triple strophes, each strophe of the nine containing six lines. In each triple strophe the first presents a woe (in the third this woe becomes an oath); the second presents a phase of the wickedness of the situation, e.g. (1) the utter formality of worship, (2) the luxury of life and apathy of feeling, (3) the pride and self-confidence; the third pictures the coming captivity, e.g. (1) captivity beyond Damascus, (2) 'a captivity at the head of the captives,' (3) the complete surrender of the country to a foreign enemy."[1]

The third section of the book of Amos (vii–ix, 8[a]) begins with three visions of judgment (vii, 1–9), to wit, one of devouring locusts, one of consuming fire, and the third of a plumb-line; in the first two visions the foretold destruction is stayed by the interposition of Yahweh's hand; but in the third the destruction is permitted to become complete. These visions are immediately followed by the episode of Amasias' meeting with Amos at Bethel (vii, 10–17): the high priest of Bethel accuses the prophet of high treason, and the latter replies by distinct predictions of woes against the former and against all Israel. The visions of destruction are now resumed. The vision of a basket of summer fruit symbolizes the speedy decay of Israel, which is described at length in an explanatory discourse (viii, 1–14). It is followed by the vision of Yahweh standing beside the altar, and threatening Israel with a chastisement from which there is no escape (ix, 1–8[a]). The book concludes with Yahweh's solemn promise of the Restoration of the House of David to its former splendor

[1] W. R. HARPER, in "the Biblical World," Oct. 1898, p. 254.

Digitized by Google

and power, and of the wonderful prosperity of the purified nation: a distinctly Messianic promise according to Acts xv.

3. Unity, Date, and Authorship. It is commonly maintained that the contents of the book of Amos centre in a great message of doom to Israel. If we except the concluding verses (ix, 8b–15), all the rest, we are told, reads like a solemn denunciation of God's judgment on Israel's incurable wickedness, like a direct proclamation of the downfall of the throne and the captivity of the nation. The general style, also, with its poetical form, and other literary characteristics of simplicity, abruptness, purity, etc., contributes to produce the impression upon the reader that the prophecy is a literary unit, the various parts of which may be traced back to one earnest and holy prophet of the Jewish people.

In view of this unity, which most scholars consider as unimpaired by the numerous passages which are sometimes held to be later additions to the book,[1] it is easy to understand how the traditional date and authorship of the prophecy of Amos, which are embodied in its title,[2] and apparently affirmed in the body of the book,[3] have held their own down to the present day. One and the same mind had presided over the gathering together of the discourses and visions which make up that prophetical writing, and no distinct traces of a later compilatory process forbade the ascription of the work to the prophet whose name it bears.

[1] These passages, which amount to almost a fifth part of the book are: i, 1, 2, 9–12; ii, 4 5; iii. 14b; iv. 13; v. 8. 9, 13–15, 26; vi. 2. 9. 10; viii. 6 8. 11–13; ix, 5, 6; 8b–15 (For a discussion of their genuineness, see DRIVER, Joel and Amos, in the Cambridge Bible, p. 117 sqq.)

[2] "The words of Amos, who was among the herdsmen of Thecua which he saw concerning Israel in the days of Ozias, king of Juda and in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joas, king of Israel."

[3] Cfr Amos vii, 1, 4; viii, 1: "These things Yahweh showed to me"; and vii, 2, 5. 8; viii. 2; ix, 1: "And I said"; "Yahweh said to me"; etc.

Digitized by Google

To confirm the traditional view of Jews and Christians in regard to authorship, appeal has also been made (1) to the fact that the writer's imagery is mainly drawn, as was to be expected from a shepherd like Amos, from rural life;[1] (2) to the agreement between the state of the kingdom of Israel under Jeroboam II. as described by Amos, and that under the same prince which is made known to us in the fourth book of Kings.[2] "The vices reproved are those which the prosperity of the kingdom would encourage the people to commit boldly. . . . So great a corruption of morals proves that the prophet arose some time after the conquests of Jeroboam, and this opinion derives strength from the title, which names King Ozias, who did not mount the throne of Juda until the 27th year of Jeroboam. The prophet seems to have published his book before Jeroboam's death."[3]

The book of Amos is commonly ascribed to about 750 B.C. For the arguments recently set forth in favor of a post-exilic date see Edw. DAY and Walter H. CHAPIN, art. "Is the book of Amos post-exilic?" in the American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Jan. 1902.

§ 3. *The Prophet Osee.*

1. Name and Life of the Prophet. The minor prophet of the Northern Kingdom who is commonly regarded as a younger contemporary of Amos is called Osee in the Septuagint and the Vulgate. This is clearly a Grecized form of the Hebrew name *Hoshe'a*, which means "help, deliverance," and which was originally borne by Josue, the son of Nun (cfr. Numb. xiii, 8, 16, 26).

[1] Cfr. E. PHILLIPE, art. Amos, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de le Bible, col. 513; J. TAYLOR, art. Amos, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, p. 87.

[2] Compare IV Kings xiv, 23–26 with Amos vi, 13, 14.

[3] JNO. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 323 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

If we set aside worthless rabbinical legends concerning Osee,[1] nothing is known of his personal history except what can be gathered from the book which bears his name. According to i, 1 he was the son of a certain Beeri,—who is otherwise unknown,—and exercised the prophetical ministry in the reigns of Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias, kings of Juda, and of Jeroboam II., king of Israel, i.e. between ab. 778 and ab. 695, and between ab. 783 and ab. 743 B.C. Perhaps "this indication of time, which agrees verbatim with Isai. i, 1 (cfr. also Micheas i, 1), is not to be regarded as originating in its present form[2] with Osee himself. Although the naming of the kings of Juda may perhaps be explained by the circumstance that the prophet regarded them as the heirs of the legitimate government and of the promises made to David's house (cfr. Amos i, 1, where, however, it should be noted that Amos was a Judæan), it is strange that only Jeroboam II. is mentioned of the kings of Israel, while the list of Judæan rulers descends much lower. . . . On the other hand, Osee scarcely continued to prophesy under Achaz and Ezechias, kings of Juda, as no notice is taken in his prophecy of the eventful war of Phacee of Israel against Achaz of Juda."[3] It remains true, however, that the contents of the book seem to bear out the view, now commonly received, that "Osee was the prophet of the decline and fall of Israel."[4] They seem likewise to prove that he was a native of the Northern Kingdom. Only an Israelite by birth, it is generally argued, would evince such an intimate knowledge of the moral condition of the kingdom of Israel, of its topography

[1] Cfr. TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 1 sq.

[2] Several scholars—HITZIG, DELITZSCH, NOWACK, ORELLI, DRIVER, etc.—have surmised that the title of the book originally spoke simply of "the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joas, king of Israel."

[3] Von ORELLI, the Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 4 sq. (Engl. Transl.).

[4] T. K. CHEYNE, Hosea (Cambridge Bible Series), p. 11.

Digitized by Google

and history, and also such constant and tender a flow of sympathy towards the Israelites, as may be noticed in the book of Osee. Again, the phrase "our king" (in vii, 15), and certain linguistic peculiarities of the work, are oftentimes referred to as pointing in the same direction.[1]

The episode of Osee's marriage, which is recorded in chaps. i, iii, has always been variously understood. According to many ancient and modern interpreters—Maimonides († 1214), Eben-Ezra († ab. 1175), Kimchi († 1240), among the Jews; Origen, St. Jerome, Rufinus, among the early Fathers; Haymon (twelfth century A.D.), Paul of Burgos († 1435), Vatable († 1547), Estius († 1613), Menochius, S.J. († 1655), Ackermann († 1831), etc., among Catholics; Calvin († 1564), Rosenmüller († 1835), Staendlin († 1826), Hitzig († 1875), Bleek († 1875), Keil († 1888), Kuenen († 1891), Reuss († 1891), Bruston, etc., among Protestants—the statement that Yahweh ordered Osee to marry a harlot, and that the prophet complied with such a command, should not be understood literally. The transaction is to be explained simply as an allegory,[2] or understood as a vision, for the purpose of symbolizing Israel's unfaithfulness as the spouse of Yahweh. According to other interpreters —among whom may be mentioned St. Irenæus, St. Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, St. Basil, St. Augustine, among the Fathers; St. Thomas Aquinas († 1274), Dom Calmet, O.S.B. († 1757), Schegg, Vigouroux, Touzard, etc., among Catholics; Kurtz († 1873), Pusey († 1882), Ewald († 1875), Plumptre, Cheyne, Orelli, etc., among Protestants—the narrative should be taken in a more or less strict literal sense. The strictly literal interpretation, according to which Yahweh would have directed Osee to marry a woman of already

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1065, footn. 2.

[2] The purely allegorical interpretation takes Yahweh to have said to Osee: "Imagine such dealings between yourself and an unfaithful wife as symbolizing my dealings with Israel."

Digitized by Google

profligate character, is now very often rejected as repugnant to our conception of God and to our thought of His prophet, and a modified literal view is usually substituted for it. This latter view—called the Experience Theory—has much in its favor, and but little against it. It supposes that at the time the phrase "woman of fornications" is used of Gomer, i.e. *post eventum*, she is all that the phrase signifies. But previous to her marriage with Osee she was such only in disposition. The marriage having taken place, Osee's home life was troubled by his sad experience of Gomer's infidelity, and the prophet "then recognized that the great calamity of his life was God's own ordinance and appointed means to communicate to him a deep prophetic lesson."[1] In his own wife, once the worthy object of his love, but afterwards unfaithful, yet to be pursued by his affection and reclaimed from her abjection, it was given him to see the image of Israel, once also the worthy object of Yahweh's love, but later on altogether unworthy of it by her unfaithfulness, yet pursued by God's unfailing love, and finally redeemed by Him from her servitude. "Whatever else may be said, when Osee relates his call to be a prophet, this event and the others mentioned in chaps. i and iii of his book are past. The real character of Gomer and her children is well known—at least to the prophet. Of this experience theory it may be said: (1) it takes a natural and the *prima facie* view of the narratives in chaps. i and iii; (2) it involves no grave moral objections; (3) it gives force to the symbolism of chaps. i and iii; (4) it lends itself, therefore, to the best understanding of these chapters."[2]

[1] "The recognition of a divine command after the fact has its parallel in Jeremias xxxii. 8" (W. R. SMITH, in Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 2123).

[2] Rev. Hugh Ross HATCH, art. the Story of Hosea, etc., in "the Biblical World," Oct. 1898, p. 258, footn. See also A. B. DAVIDSON, art. Hosea, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 421.

Digitized by Google

As regards the rank of life to which the prophet belonged, there is nothing in his book that can give us a definite cue. His frequent references to the priests (iv, 6, 9; v, 1; vi, 9), to the *Torah* of God (iv, 6; viii, 12), to "unclean things" (v, 3; vi, 10; ix, 3), to "abominations" (ix, 10), and to persecution in "the house of his God" (ix, 7, 8), have indeed led Duhm and others to think that Osee was a member of the priestly order. But such an inference is no more warranted by the facts of the case than would be the view that he was a shepherd or a husbandman on account of his numerous references to agricultural life in its manifold aspects.[1]

The length of Osee's ministry cannot be made out from the data afforded by his prophecy,[2] and the circumstances of his death are absolutely unknown. His name is entered on the Roman martyrology for July 4th.

2. Contents of the Book of Osee. The prophecy of Osee is divided into two parts: chaps. i–iii and chaps. iv–xiv. The first part deals with the circumstances which led the prophet to undertake his ministry, and has the appearance of a narrative of his domestic experiences in which the substance of his message to Israel finds symbolic expression. In a first prose section (i, 2–9) we are told how Osee gave to the three children of Gomer, his unfaithful wife, symbolical and fateful names: the first, a son, he called *Jezrahel*, as a token of the vengeance exacted of the house of Jehu, on the very spot where formerly that prince had massacred the house of Achab;[3] the second, a daughter, he named *Lo'-Ruḥamah* ("Not-pitied"), designating thereby Yahweh's withdrawal of affection for Israel; to the third, a

[1] Cfr. for references to the Sacred Text, A. B. DAVIDSON, art. Hosea, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 420.

[2] Cfr. Abbé LESÊTRE, Introd. à l'Etude de l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p 503, footn. 2.

[3] IV Kings x, 11.

Digitized by Google

son, he gave the name of *Lo'-ʿammi* ("Not-my-people"), distinctly expressive of the treatment of Israel as a foreign people. To this first section is now appended (i, 10–ii, 1) a promise of the restoration of Juda and Israel under one head, and of their coming up from Exile to take possession of Palestine, after which they will resume the use of the two titles ("My People," "Pitied") which have just been discarded, and accost one another in terms implying their restoration to Yahweh's favor.[1]

The second, a poetical, section[2] (ii, 2–24, taken together with its real sequel, i, 10–ii, 1) is a continuous exposition partly (verses 2–13) of the foregoing, and partly (14–24, i, 10–ii, 1) of the following, sections. The first five strophes (2–13) tell plainly that the nation has deserted its consort, its true God, for lovers, the Baalim or false gods, so that it must be punished. The remaining strophes—anticipating the narrative in the third chapter—show how the punishment inflicted on Israel is in God's purpose a means of sincere reformation which will secure restoration to divine favor and the enjoyment of the brightest future.

The third, a prose, section (chap. iii) "attaches itself to chap. i, 1–9. The last symbolical word in chap. i was *Lo'-ʿammi* ('Not-my-people'), pointing to an actual divorce by Yahweh of His people, or at least a casting of them out of His house. Chap. iii continues the story. 'And Yahweh said to me: Again, go love a woman, loved of a paramour and an adulteress, as Yahweh loveth the children of Israel, though they turn to other gods.' The woman whom Osee is bidden again go love is of course the same woman, Gomer, of the first chapter. She is a woman loved of a paramour and an adulteress. The word *Lo'-ʿammi* (i, 9) suggests the

[1] Cfr DRIVER, Introd. to Liter of Old Test., p 302 sq. The appendix to the first section (i, 10–ii, 1 in the Vulgate; ii, 1–3 in the Hebrew Bible) stood originally at the end of chap. ii (cfr. CHEYNE, loc. cit., p 45).

[2] The strophic arrangement of its parallel lines can be easily made out.

Digitized by Google

unrecorded step in the history: the woman had fled or been driven from the prophet's house and become the slave-concubine of another. He is bidden renew his love to her. So he acquired her again to himself for a small price (that of a slave, Exod. xxi, 32), returning to her in mind, but deferring for a long time to return to her in union (iii, 3). The explanation is added: 'The children of Israel shall remain many days without king and without sacrifice,' etc. Yahweh's love continues with His people, whom He shall keep in long restraint and discipline in exile, till their mind change and they seek Him."[1]

The second part of the book of Osee (chaps. iv–xiv) is generally regarded as a series of prophetical discourses, no doubt, on account of the form of a direct address assumed by its contents. It remains true, however, that despite all the efforts so far made by scholars and interpreters to point out the beginning and the end, and even the general trend, of the assumed discourses, the natural divisions and subdivisions of the eleven last chapters of Osee are still a matter of uncertainty. In fact several prominent scholars, struck with the unsatisfactory character of the various divisions that have been suggested, willingly adopt Bishop Lowth's view that this part of the book is "fragmentary and wanting in consecutiveness,"[2] and in consequence abstain from setting forth divisions more or less questionable. Perhaps lack of success in this direction is due to the fact that the oratorical character of chaps. iv–xiv has been exaggerated, while their strophic structure has been overlooked:[3] had these poetical divisions of the second part of

[1] A. B. DAVIDSON, art. Hosea, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 421.

[2] W. H. BENNETT, a Primer of the Bible, p. 20. LOWTH deemed the prophecies in Amos (iv–xiv) so scattered and unconnected that he compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl.

[3] The poetical character of Osee iv–xiv was distinctly admitted by Jno. JAHN a century ago (Introd. to Old Test., p. 329, Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

Osee been studied and made out with something of the care bestowed on the book of Amos, it is not unlikely that the consecutiveness and detailed import of these important chapters of Osee would have been distinctly realized and gradually accepted.

Be this as it may, the leading ideas of the second part of Osee may be briefly indicated as follows.[1] Israel's corruption is so great as to require its prompt punishment, for the people had unfortunately followed its leaders, priests, and rulers. It is vain to reckon on the help of foreign powers; vain to turn to God in one of those fits of repentance which contrast so much with flagrant public transgressions of the divine law; vain to rely on the saving efficacy of numerous sacrifices, while immorality prevails at court, in the temples, and in all the ranks of society. The punishment will be severe, and the ruin total, for Yahweh's tender and enduring love for Israel has been outraged. Yet the final note struck by the prophetical voice is that of a glorious promise in favor of Israel: God's anger will be ultimately turned away from His repentant and faithful people,

> For the ways of Yahweh are right:
> The just shall walk in them.
> But the transgressors shall fall therein. (Osee xiv, 10.)

3. Authorship, Integrity, and Text. Till quite recently it was universally admitted that the general contents of the book of Osee confirm powerfully the traditional authorship embodied in the title: "The word of Yahweh that came to Osee, the son of Beeri, in the days of Ozias, Joatham, Achaz, and Ezechias, kings of Juda, and in the days of Jeroboam, the son of Joas, king of Israel."[2] It was thought that the moral and religious condition of the

[1] For details in this regard, see A. B. DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 423 sqq.; DRIVER. Introd. to Liter. of Old Test., p. 303 sqq.

[2] Osee, i, 1.

Digitized by Google

Northern Kingdom described in Osee, with the low morality of its princes and priests, with its mixture of Baal and Yahweh worship, and its confidence in mere external rites to placate the true God, etc., corresponded exactly with the general state of morality and religion which is described in Isaias, the great prophet of the eighth century. It was also regarded for certain that the political devices resorted to by the leaders of Israel to secure now the alliance of Egypt and now that of Assyria are practically identical in both Isaias and Osee, whom their titles represent as prophesying under the very same kings of Juda. But more particularly it was claimed that most of the prophecies of Osee suit a time of anarchy and disorder, such as succeeded the death of Jeroboam II. Finally, as no passage was considered to imply the actual destruction of the Northern Kingdom, it was maintained, without the least doubt, that the prophet Osee arranged himself the prophecies as they stand at present. "The first two chapters," we are told,[1] "contain the substance of what he did and wrote while the house of Jehu was still on the throne, i.e. in the days of Jeroboam II. The last twelve refer to the time after the death of Jeroboam, when Israel was inclined to apply for help, sometimes to Egypt, sometimes to Assyria. Kings were set up and deposed in rapid succession, and military power was trusted in rather than Yahweh. It is not surprising, therefore, that the prophet denounces and threatens. . . . Redolob is the only critic who has questioned the integrity of the book. He supposes that the passage in vii, 4–10 is made up of marginal glosses, which is a very arbitrary hypothesis not demanding a refutation."

The traditional view thus described by Samuel Davidson, in 1863, has remained the one generally accepted by scholars down to the present day. According to many critics,

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 236.

Digitized by Google

however, it should be somewhat modified, and a fair number of passages should be ascribed to a date later than Osee. Thus, "passages contrasting Juda with Israel, e.g. i, 7; iv, 15; xi, 12, and less frequently other references to Juda, e.g. vi, 11; viii, 14, are supposed to be additions by later Jewish editors. . . . Similar views are held by some as to passages promising restoration to Israel, e.g. i, 10, 11; ii, 6, 7, 14, 16, 18–23; iii, 5; v, 15–vi, 3; xi, 8[b], 9[a], 10, 11; xiv."[1] In fact, as the statements suspectedly or admittedly late have grown in number, some scholars have been led to question, or even to reject, the traditional authorship. Prof. Bennett, for instance, writes significantly: "The lack of orderly sequence shows that the book cannot have been compiled by the prophet himself, unless it has since suffered much at the hands of editors."[2] More recently still (Jan. 1902) two critics tell us that "of the date of Osee they can speak confidently. It is post-exilic."[3] Most of the grounds in favor of this last view are similar to those that have been set forth in reference to the post-exilic date of Amos, and on that account need not be insisted upon. They are chiefly drawn from the Aramaic—and consequently late—character of the Hebrew of the book,[4] and from what seem to be distinct references to exilic or post-exilic events.[5]

As regards the condition of the Hebrew Text of Osee, scholars agree generally that it has been imperfectly handed down. The more they study it, the more they discover textual imperfections, for the correction of which the Septuagint Version is of comparatively little use.

[1] W. H. Bennett, a Biblical Introduction, p. 236–7.

[2] Ibid., p. 235.

[3] Edw. Day and Walter H. Chapin, in the Americal Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Jan. 1902, p. 93, footn.

[4] See the list of Aramaisms admitted by Vigouroux, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no 1075, footn. 2.

[5] Cfr. iv. 19; vi, 11[b]; vii, 13[a]; xiv. 1; etc.

Digitized by Google

§ 4. *The Prophet Micheas.*

1. His Name and Personal History. The third, and last, minor prophet whose work is referred to the eighth century B.C. is "Micheas the Morasthite."[1] His name, *Micheas*, a Grecized form of the Hebrew *Michaiah* (commonly abbreviated into *Michah*), means "who is like Yahweh?" The epithet "the Morasthite," given him in i, 1 of his prophecy, and in Jerem. xxvi, 18, serves to distinguish him from an older prophet of the same name who lived under Achab and is spoken of in III Kings xxii, 8. This surname is probably derived from the place of his birth, the village of *Moresheth* of which he speaks in i, 14 of his book, and which was part of the territory of Geth.[2]

No particulars are known of Micheas' personal history. As the name of his father is not mentioned in the title to his prophecy, it has been surmised that the family to which he belonged was not very important in Juda. In fact, from the deep interest evinced by the writer in the poor and the peasantry, as also from the indignation he gives vent to against the nobles who daily stripped the poorer agriculturists of their houses and holdings by violence or false judgment,[3] it may be gathered that he was one not of the oppressors, but of the oppressed. Of the manner in which he was called from his humble walk in life to his exalted mission as a prophet of Yahweh, nothing is known. Even the exact date and duration of his prophetical ministry cannot be fully ascertained.

[1] Micheas is named the third in the Septuagint, and the sixth in the Hebrew, lists of the Minor Prophets.

[2] The Vulgate treats the word MORESHETH as if it were a common name and renders it by "hereditas." But St. Jerome knew of it as the proper name of a town situated not far from, and to the east of, Eleutheropolis, in the kingdom of Juda.

[3] Cfr. W. R. SMITH, the Prophets of Israel, p. 289.

Digitized by Google

The heading in i, 1 gives indeed as the prophet's time the reigns of Joathan, Achaz, and Ezechias, kings of Juda; but "the similarity of this statement to data found in Osee i, 1, Isai. i, 1, in both which passages certainly Ozias precedes, raises the suspicion that it may come from the same hand that revised Osee i, 1."[1] It is true also that Mich. iii, 12 is quoted in Jeremias xxvi, 17, 18 as spoken by "Micheas the Morasthite in the days of Ezechias," and that, in this way, the second part of the heading seems to be confirmed. But after this is granted, it becomes difficult to see how Micheas' activity could have been exercised before the time of that prince, as stated in the first part of the title, for chap. iii is closely linked with the preceding chapters, so that these also should apparently be connected with the reign of Ezechiast and not with that of his predecessors, Joatham and Achaz. This has led many critics to regard as probable that Micheas' prophetical mission began first under Ezechias, all the more so because the dark picture in the closing chapters (vi, vii), by suggesting to their mind the days of Manasses, seems to imply that the prophet's activity extended beyond the reign of Ezechias, and therefore to secure for Micheas, what they deem to be a fairly long prophetical ministry.

"The legends concerning Micheas' death and burial which are found in the Pseudo-Epiphanius and the Pseudo-Dorotheus arose partly from a confusion of that minor prophet with Micheas, son of Yimlah (III Kings xxii, 8), partly from conclusions drawn from his prophecy. Micheas' feast is celebrated on Jan. 15th, by the Latin, and on April 15th, by the Greek, Church."[2]

2. Contents of the Book of Micheas. It is difficult to give an accurate and satisfactory analysis of the book of

[1] VON ORELLI, the Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 185 (Engl. Transl.).
[2] TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 248.

Digitized by Google

Micheas. The commonly-received division of its contents into three parts (i–ii; iii–v; vi–vii) seems at first sight very plausible, inasmuch as each of the parts begins with "Hear ye," and closes with a promise. When more closely examined, however, this threefold division is seen not to have been originally intended. The first Hebrew word of the second part ("And I said") is too abrupt to stand at the commencement, and is more probably to be connected directly with ii, 11, to which it is a natural sequel in thought and in grammatical form. Again, the abrupt transitions which abound in each of the three sections point to oracles primitively separate which have been put together so as to make up discourses of more or less considerable length.[1] Another division of the book, likewise into three parts (i–iii; iv–v; vi–vii) has also been proposed. It is perhaps preferable to the former because it pays attention to the nature of the contents themselves. "The first part," we are told, "is threatening. It describes the divine anger against the iniquities of the rulers of the Southern Kingdom in spite of all the counter-assurances of the false prophets. The second part is chiefly Messianic. The last shows the separation existing between the people and Yahweh, instructing, exhorting, and endeavoring to effect the reconciliation of the former to their great king."[2] This second division has, like the former, the serious drawback of not taking into account the various oracles the compilation of which[3] is now called the book of Micheas.

Be this as it may, the chief elements of the prophecy of Micheas may be briefly indicated as follows. Together with the general heading (i, 1) the opening chapter seems to contain two originally distinct oracles. The first (verses 2–7)

[1] Cfr. T. K. CHEYNE, Micah (in the Cambridge Bible), p. 10; J. TOUZARD, les Prophètes d'Israel, p. 123; etc.

[2] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 285.

[3] Cfr. TROCHON, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

announces the forthcoming punishment of both Israel and Juda, while the second (8–16) declares the writer's purpose to wail and mourn, exhorting the people likewise to lament. It must be stated, however, that many contemporary scholars regard this first chapter as a unit presenting a well-connected prophecy of judgment.

The next two chapters (ii, iii) are often considered as forming a single prophecy, the subject of which is the cause of the coming judgment on the nation, viz., the sins of the great men and the rulers of the Jews. Yet it is beyond doubt that they are made up of primitively distinct oracles, as may be seen in the following scheme:

ii, 1–5.	Micheas' rebuke of the rich men of Juda;
ii, 6–11.	Hostility between the two classes of prophets;
ii, 12, 13.	Return of the exiles under Yahweh's leadership;[1]
iii, 1–4.	New rebuke of the oppressing rich rulers;
iii, 5–7.	The fate of the false prophets;
iii, 8–12.	Courageous denunciation of the sins of the people by Yahweh's prophet.

Chaps. iv and v are usually regarded as belonging together, because they both contain Messianic hopes and promises. Their various component elements are as follows:[2]

iv, 1–4.	The future exaltation of Sion;
iv, 6–7.	Prophecy of restoration from exile;
iv, 8–v, 1.	Siege and deliverance of Jerusalem;
v, 2–9.	The Messianic king and kingdom;
v, 10–14.	The destruction of warlike implements and of idolatry.

In the last section of the prophecy (vi, vii), the general theme of which is a controversy between Yahweh and His

[1] These two verses differ in thought and style from their context, and are usually considered as an addition which interrupts the general prophecy in ii. iii.

[2] CHEYNE (loc. cit., p. 34) writes: "The original draft of the prophecy seems to have been contained in iv, 1–4, 11–13; v 1–4, 7–15."

Digitized by Google

people, four distinct oracles,—besides the hymn which concludes the whole book (vii, 18–20),—may be pointed out:

vi, 1–8. Yahweh's complaint against His people, and the latter's willingness to offer atonement;
vi, 9–16. Yahweh's denunciation of the crimes of Jerusalem;
vii, 1–6. Desolate condition of Israel;
vii, 7–17. Israel's firm hope in Yahweh's intervention.

3. Date and Authorship of the Prophecy. Till about the middle of the nineteenth century, it was almost universally admitted, chiefly on the strength of the title to the prophecy, and of the quotation of Mich. iii, 12 in Jerem. xxvi, 17, 18, that Micheas, the Morasthite, wrote the entire book which bears his name. It was also taken for granted that "he published the work before the sixth year of Ezechias, 722 B.C., when the kingdom of Israel was overthrown, for he constantly speaks of that fateful event as future." [1] Even at the present day a large number of scholars regard the traditional authorship as tenable, and think that "the book is a well-articulated whole, certainly arranged by the author himself. Its subdivisions," they tell us, "grow out of particular discourses of the prophet, not, however, without connection among themselves, as is most plainly observable between chaps. iii and iv." [2] And yet many of those who still speak of the book as written by Micheas have been somewhat influenced by the critical work carried on in regard to that minor prophet during the last twenty-five years. Gradually they have been led to admit that ii, 12, 13 is a late passage, or at least is out of place in its present context, and to look upon the oracles in chaps. vi, vii as probably referring to the reign of Manasses, Ezechias' son and successor, though it is claimed that even in such a case, Micheas may be the author

[1] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 331 (Engl. Transl.).
[2] VON ORELLI, the Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 188 (Engl. Transl.).

Digitized by Google

of those chapters, since, for all that we know, the prophet may have outlived Ezechias' time.

Of late, the tendency among critics is to question the traditional authorship of nearly two thirds of the book of Micheas. "Against the composition of chaps. iv, v by Micheas there are the following objections: (1) the strange conjunction of the Messianic hopes of iv, 1 sqq. with the threatenings of iii, 12; (2) the circumstance that mutually exclusive views present themselves (cfr. iv, 6–8 with verse 9 sq.; iv, 11–13 with v, 1; v, 2–4 with verse 5 sq.), and that frequently a connection can be established only by very artificial methods (cfr. iv, 4 with verse 5; iv, 8 with verse 9 sq.; iv, 11–13 with v, 1 sqq.); (3) the dependence upon trains of ideas which did not become current till after the time of Micheas (cfr. iv, 11–13 with Ezech. xxxviii sq.), as well as the presupposing of relations which were strange to Micheas' era (cfr. iv, 6–8 [ii, 12 sq.] v, 2 sqq.)."[1] For these and similar reasons, chaps. iv, v are oftentimes considered as a compilation of separate fragments, some of which are held to be either exilic or post-exilic.

Serious difficulties are also urged against the composition of chaps. vi, vii by Micheas. In regard to vi, 1–vii, 6, it is felt that the hope and buoyancy which Isaias kindled, and which left their impress upon the pages of Micheas (in chap. i sqq.), have given way in vi sq. to despondency and sadness. Micheas declaims, it is said, against the leaders of the nation only; in chap. vi sq. the corruption has extended to the entire people; and vi, 1–8, 16, together with the dark picture in vii, 1–6, point, we are told, *directly* to the age of Manasses as that in which vi, 1–vii, 6 was composed. Of course, if written under Manasses, the author might still be Micheas, were it not that the difference in form and structure between this section

[1] W. NOWACK, art. Micah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. iii p. 359.

Digitized by Google

and the preceding (chap. i sqq.) makes it improbable that both are by the same author. Chap. vi sq. is dramatic in structure; the prophecy is distributed between different interlocutors in a manner which is far from common in the prophets, and is altogether alien from chap. i sqq.[1] Whence it has been inferred by Ewald, and by many critics after him, that vi, 1–vii, 6 should rather be ascribed to an unknown writer living in the reign of Manasses. The cautious remarks of Prof. Driver in this connection are well worth quoting: "Ewald's *date* for vi, 1–vii, 6 is exceedingly probable; though we cannot affirm with equal confidence that Micheas is not the author. With such a small basis as chaps. i–v to argue from, we are hardly entitled to pronounce the dramatic form of vi, 1 sqq. inconsistent with Micheas' authorship. At the same time, there is a difference of tone and manner in vi, 1–vii, 6, as compared with chaps. i–v, which, so far as it goes, tells against, rather than in favor of, identity of author: instead of Micheas' sharp and forceful sentences, we have here a strain of reproachful tenderness and regret; and, as Kuenen remarks, the prophecy does not, as would be natural if the author were the same, carry on, or develop, lines of thought contained in chaps. i–v. The point is one on which it is not possible to pronounce confidently; but internal evidence, it must be owned, tends to support Ewald's conclusion."[2]

As regards vii, 7–20 the main difficulty to the traditional authorship and date lies in its contrast with vi, 1–vii, 6. For, what in the latter passage is yet in prospect, has in the former actually come to pass: Sion suffers for her sins, and the writer looks forward now to a better time, when Yahweh will again interest Himself on behalf of His people and build the

[1] Cfr EWALD as summarized by DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test p. 332.
[2] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 333.

Digitized by Google

walls of Jerusalem. Between vii, 6 and vii, 7 there yawns a century. Besides, there prevails a remarkable similarity between vii, 7–20 and the Deutero-Isaias, so that both could naturally be ascribed to about the same time.[1] And yet there are able scholars who, though not ignoring the plausibility of the objections raised against the early date of vii, 7–20, still incline to ascribe it to the time of Manasses.

Prof. W. H. Bennett's moderate words concerning the whole question are to the effect that "it is difficult to resist the impression that there is a marked contrast in style and thought between i–iii and iv–vii, which suggests a different age and author for the latter section; but it is *equally* difficult to estimate the evidential value of such an impression."[2]

[1] For details, see WELLHAUSEN'S grounds in DRIVER'S Introd., p. 332, sq.
[2] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introd., p. 247.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XVI.

THE MINOR PROPHETS OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY B.C.: NAHUM, SOPHONIAS, AND HABACUC.

I. THE LAST FORTY YEARS OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY B.C.

(Chief Events and General Character.)

II. THE PROPHET NAHUM:

1. His Name and Birthplace.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - Opening Alphabetical Poem (i, 2–ii, 1, 3).
   - The Prophecy Proper (ii, 2, 4–iii).
3. Date and Authorship of the Prophecy.

III. THE PROPHET SOPHONIAS:

1. His Name and Royal Descent.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - Threats (i, 2–iii, 8).
   - Promises (iii, 9–20).
3. Date and Authorship of the Prophecy.
4. Literary Characteristics and Condition of the Text of his Book.

IV. THE PROPHET HABACUC:

1. Meaning of his Name. Legends concerning Him.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - Three Principal Views regarding the Body of the Book (1, 2–ii).
   - The Concluding Psalm (iii).
   - Strophical Structure of the Prophecy.
3. Date and Authorship of the Prophecy.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVI.

THE MINOR PROPHETS OF THE SEVENTH CENTURY B.C.: NAHUM, SOPHONIAS, AND HABACUC.

§ 1. *The Last Forty Years of the Seventh Century B.C.*

THE ministry of the three minor prophets Nahum, Sophonias, and Habacuc is generally assigned to the last forty years of the seventh century B.C. At the beginning of that period, traces of the idolatrous worship which had been prevalent in Juda during the reigns of Manasses (686–641 B.C.) and Amon (641–639 B.C.) could still be seen in Jerusalem, while a long-prepared reaction in favor of Yahweh worship was about to set in. Two chief obstacles, however, were in the way of such a reaction: first, the tender age at which Josias ascended the throne of Juda, in 639 B.C. (he was only "eight years old" at his accession); and secondly, the terrible inroads of the Scythian hordes which began about 630 B.C. The reaction was simply delayed, and in fact was rendered stronger by the delay. The evils of the invasion were easily represented as a punishment for the sins of the land, and the various parties at work to bring about a reaction (priests, prophets, prominent laymen) made the most of Josias' tender age to organize all the better that they might secure a thorough and permanent return of the nation to the true God. In 621 B.C. the "Book of the Law" found in the Temple was solemnly

Digitized by Google

read to the assembled people, and a vigorous reaction was begun on the basis of its contents.

After Josias' reformation, Juda enjoyed a breathing-space of peace and prosperity. The Scythian hordes had apparently withdrawn, and the Assyrian empire was dwindling rapidly after the death of its last great monarch, Assurbanipal (626 B.C.). The Syrian states and Israel had been crushed, so that Juda was for a time the strongest power in Palestine, and Josias was able to extend his authority over part of Ephraim. Meanwhile Babylon was fast aggrandizing itself at the expense of Assyria, but its claim to supremacy over Western Asia was disputed by the Egyptian king Nechao, who marched to Palestine on his way to the Euphrates. As a faithful vassal of the new Chaldæan empire, Josias opposed Nechao, and was defeated at Mageddo, and mortally wounded (609 B.C.). The Assyrians were now so weakened that the ruin of their power was easily secured by the combined forces of Media and Babylonia: Ninive fell in 606 B.C. Finally, the struggle for supremacy in Western Asia between Babylon and Egypt was brought to an end by the signal defeat of Nechao's army at Carchemis, in the year 604 B. C.

The last forty years of the seventh century naturally appeared to those who lived through them "a time of unsettlement, disruption, terror, and distress of nations." [1] The chief national calamity for Juda during that period was Josias' fall on the battle-field of Mageddo, and neither the subsequent ruin of Ninive, the oppressing city which had so long been the scourge of Western Asia, nor the signal defeat of Egypt—that is, of the power which had been the occasion of Josias' death—seemed, in the eyes of Yahweh's faithful adherents, anything like a sufficient vindication of God's providence in allowing the

[1] R. L. OTTLEY, the Hebrew Prophets, p. 45.

Digitized by Google

inglorious death of a prince so pious and, everything considered, so successful in promoting religious reforms in Israel.

For details concerning the political and religious condition of Juda after the demise of Josias, see the opening remarks to chapter xi of the present volume.

§ 2. *The Prophet Nahum* (*ab. 626–608 B.C.*).

1. His Name and Birthplace. In all the lists of the twelve minor prophets, Nahum stands the first of those who are usually referred to the seventh century B.C. His name, very likely connected with the Hebrew intensive form *Naḥḥum*, means primarily "full of consolation or comfort," and perhaps, in a derived sense, "consoler, comforter." It is probably contracted from the fuller word *Naḥḥumiah* (cfr. *Nehemiah*), which signifies "Yahweh is full of consolation, or consoler." [1]

In the title to his book, Nahum is called "the Elcesite" (in Hebrew, the *'elqoshi*), an epithet which all scholars regard as referring to the prophet's birthplace, *'elqosh*. The exact site of this small town cannot be determined at the present day. The identification of *'elqosh* with the Christian village of *'alqush*,[2] about 27 miles due north of Mosoul, is certainly to be rejected, for it does not date back beyond the sixteenth century of our era, and is easily accounted for by the subject-matter of Nahum's prophecy: "the burden of Ninive" (Nah. i, 1). The identification of the town with the various sites in Galilee which have been suggested at different times—(1) Capharnaum, "the Village of Nahum," the primitive name of which has been supposed to be *'elqosh*; (2) "*Helceseus*"

[1] Cfr. A. R. S. KENNEDY art. Nahum, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. iii, p. 473.

[2] The tomb of Nahum is still shown there just as the tomb of Jonas, whose book also deals with Ninive, is shown at *N^ebhi Yunus*, to the south of Mosoul (the ancient Ninive).

Digitized by Google

(possibly the same as the modern *'elqozeh* in Northern Galilee), mentioned by St. Jerome in the prologue to his commentary on Nahum—is hardly less improbable; for, had Nahum belonged to a family of Israel, he most likely would have referred to the misfortunes of the Northern Kingdom. The birthplace of the prophet was very probably in Juda, and the tradition recorded in the Pseudo-Epiphanius, that Nahum was a native of a hamlet near the ancient Eleutheropolis, may be correct.[1]

2. Contents of the Book of Nahum. After the title, which gives us the name and the birthplace of the prophet,—practically all that we know of his personality,—the book of Nahum contains an alphabetical poem (i, 2–ii, 1, 3)[2], the existence of which has been, as we think, proved by the labors of Bickell, Gunkel, and Nowack.[3] This acrostic psalm on the "Day of Yahweh" describes a theophany in which the God of Israel destroys the enemies of His people. It sets forth the principles on which the Almighty inflicts His judgments, and is a fit introduction to the two odes on the approaching fall of Ninive, which form the prophecy proper (ii, 2, 4–iii).

The first ode (ii, 2, 4–14) gives a graphic picture of the attack on Ninive, its capture, overthrow, and resulting desolation. First of all, the prophet depicts the approach of the hostile warriors in scarlet uniforms and with steel-mounted chariots (ii, 2, 4). Then he describes the conflict outside the walls (verse 5). On this follows the approach to the walls and assault upon them (6). But the immediate source of danger

[1] Cfr. A. R. S. KENNEDY, loc cit., p. 474.

[2] The references to chap. ii follow the verse numerotation of the Massoretic Text which is *one more* throughout than in the Vulgate.

[3] Of the twenty two original verses of the alphabetical poem ten can be easily recognized in the Massoretic Text; the next four or five can be made out only with difficulty for the original form of the Hebrew has been less carefully preserved, while the rest are in such a poor textual condition as to render the restoration of the poetical lines very problematic.

Digitized by Google

is elsewhere, for the protecting dams and sluices are burst open (7); hence the panic in the palace, which is immediately stormed and quickly captured with its inmates (8). The following verses (9, 10) describe the sack of the city. Finally, the desolation of the queen of cities is vividly set forth (11–14): it is now a "wild and weary waste," and, to the writer's unfeigned delight, the Assyrian, once brave as a lion and as cruel, has passed away for ever.[1]

The second ode (chap. iii) develops and confirms the theme of the first: the "city of blood," full of rapine and prey, shall be stormed and sacked (verse 1). The following verses (2–3) are a vivid picture of the assailing chariots and horsemen. Ninive, continues the writer, fully deserves her awful fate, on account of her crafty policy, her corruption and sorceries (4–7). As little will she be able to avert her ruin as was No-Ammon (Thebes, in Upper Egypt), which also had the waters for a rampart (8–11). Her fortified outposts, with their effeminate defenders, have already been taken: now is the time to prepare for the siege (12–14). Ninive is fallen! her countless and unpatriotic merchants have vanished as locusts, and in hatred and disdain all that have suffered at her hands rejoice at seeing her proud empire for ever done away with (15–19).

3. Date and Authorship of the Prophecy. The two odes which make up the body of the prophecy of Nahum are universally considered as the work of that prophet. The only point in question regarding them is the precise date to which they should be referred. The *terminus a quo* is supplied by the capture of No-Ammon, in 664 B.C., which is spoken of as a past event (iii, 8 sqq.); the *terminus ad quem*

[1] Cfr. A. R. S. KENNEDY (loc. cit., p. 474 sq.), who supposes that the words "Thus saith Yahweh" now found at the head of i 12 are part of the original introduction to the first ode.

Digitized by Google

by the downfall of Ninive, in 606 B.C. "The upper limit (664 B.C.) is fatal both to the earliest tradition known to us, according to which Nahum prophesied 115 years before the fall of Ninive (JOSEPHUS, Antiq. of the Jews, Book ix, chap. xi, § 3), and to the conclusions of older scholars, such as Pusey, Nägelsbach, etc., who placed the prophecy in the reign of Ezechias or the earlier years of Manasses."[1] The lower limit, which is being admitted by an increasing number of writers, is "the moment between the actual invasion of Assyria by a hostile force and the commencement of the attack on its capital. The 'mauler' or destroyer is already on the march (ii, 2); the frontier fortresses have opened their gates to the foe (iii, 12–13, where note the tenses which imply that the fact has already occurred). The latter, it is clear (iii, 14, 15), has not yet begun to invest the city. Such was the situation when Nahum received the prophetic impulse to proclaim to the 'city of blood' that the cup of her iniquities was full to overflowing. . . . The whole of the prophecy proper palpitates with the conviction that the 'utter end' (i, 9) of the Assyrian is at hand. The closing verses of the prophecy (iii, 18, 19), in particular, are strangely out of place if the writer has in view any other but the final attack, B.C. 608–607."[2] Such an approximate date is—all that has been said to the contrary notwithstanding—in harmony (1) with the composition of the opening alphabetical poem by Nahum, for the distress of Ninive referred to in i, 9, 12 acquires a wonderful reality and naturalness if it is taken as the final one; (2) with the general characteristics of Hebrew prophecy, according to which the prophet speaks, in the first instance, to his own contemporaries, his message being intimately

[1] A. R. S. KENNEDY, loc. cit., p. 476.—The discovery by Fr. SCHEIL, O.P. of the stele of Nabonidus, has made it almost certain that Ninive fell in 606 B.C. (Cfr. A. B. DAVIDSON, Nahum, p. 137 sq.)

[2] A. R. S. KENNEDY, loc. cit.—The siege of Ninive lasted two years.

Digitized by Google

related with the circumstances of his time, and his promises and predictions, how far they reach into the future, nevertheless resting upon the basis of the history of his own age, and corresponding to the needs which are then felt.[1]

As regards the date and authorship of the opening alphabetical poem, it is supposed by some scholars that the traditional view which ascribes it to Nahum should be given up. "The artificiality of the acrostic form," they tell us, "is generally supposed to point to a late rather than an early date for the poems which show this construction."[2] Again, the abstract tone of the composition contrasts widely with the concrete character of the two odes which all regard as Nahum's work: while these deal explicitly with the actual circumstances of Ninive's destruction, the alphabetical psalm has to do exclusively with the general principle of Yahweh's avenging justice. Apparently "the author of this psalm," we are told, "lived at some period of the post-exilic history, when the yoke of the heathen pressed heavily on the people of God, whose coming to judge the oppressor and vindicate His own could not be long delayed. The poem, it was felt at a later period, fitly expressed the general principle of God's avenging justice, of which the destruction of Ninive was the most striking concrete illustration. Accordingly, it was prefixed as an appropriate introduction to the genuine 'vision of Nahum the 'elqoshite.'"[3]

Although these arguments for a post-exilic date of Nahum i, 2–ii, 1, 3 are not altogether devoid of plausibility, they are not sufficient to disprove its pre-exilic origin, and to establish the theory that this canticle, unlike the rest of the prophecy which bears his name, should not be ascribed to Nahum.

[1] Cfr. DRIVER, Introd. to Liter. of Old Test., p. 237.
[2] A. R. S. KENNEDY, loc. cit., p. 475.
[3] A. R. S. KENNEDY loc. cit. See also J. K. CHEYNE, Introd. to Isaiah, p. 112.

Digitized by Google

§ 3. *The Prophet Sophonias* (*ab. 626–621 B.C.*).

1. His Name and Royal Descent. The name and ancestry of the second minor prophet of the seventh century B.C. are given in the opening title to his book: "The word of Yahweh that came to Sophonias, the son of Chusi, the son of Godolias, the son of Amarias, the son of Ezechias, in the days of Josias, the son of Amon, king of Juda." The name Sophonias is the Grecized form of the Hebrew *Çᵉphaniah*, which means "he whom Yahweh has hidden or protected." Together with this sense, St. Jerome, deriving the name from the root *Çaphah*, gives as a possible signification of Sophonias *speculator Domini*, "watcher of Yahweh," an appropriate appellation for a prophet.[1] The pedigree of Sophonias is traced to his fourth ancestor, Ezechias. As the genealogy of a prophet is not usually carried higher up than his father,[2] Eben Ezra inferred,—and his inference has been accepted as plausible by most modern scholars,—that Ezechias, the highest link in the chain of Sophonias' ancestry, was the Judæan king of that name. It is true that the epithet "King of Juda" is not added after Ezechias, but the name of so illustrious an ancestor needed not the addition, and as the expression "King of Juda" had to follow the name of Josias at the end of the title (chap. i, 1), its insertion after Ezechias would have been awkward.[3] Besides, Sophonias' close acquaintance with the Holy City, and more especially his strictures upon "the

[1] "Nomen sophoniæ alii *speculam*, alii *arcanum* Domini transtulerunt." (Comm. on Sophon. i. 1.)

[2] Cfr. Isai. i. 1. Jerem. i, 1: Ezech. i, 1: Joel i, 1.

[3] The fact that there is one generation more between Sophonias and Ezechias than between Josias, Sophionas' contemporary, and that monarch, is no absolute difficulty to the royal descent of the prophet (cfr. TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 347: A. B. DAVIDSON, Zephaniah (in the Cambridge Bible), p. 95 sq.; etc.).

Digitized by Google

princes and the king's sons" (i, 8) are best understood when he is considered as of kingly lineage.

2. Contents of the Book of Sophonias. After its opening title, which gives the prophet's name, ancestors, and time of ministry, the book of Sophonias deals "with the Doom of Juda and Jerusalem and all nations in the Day of Yahweh."[1] The first part (i, 2–iii, 8) announces a destruction which is apparently to embrace the whole world, but which is directed in particular against the corrupt worship of Juda and Jerusalem (i, 2–6). The "Day of Yahweh" is at hand, the day of the great sacrifice, in which the unfaithful Jews will be the victims, and in which the pagan nations, "sanctified" for the occasion,[2] are summoned to share. Three classes in Juda will be visited with particularly severe judgment: the court officials, the merchants, and the Jews sunk in religious indifferentism (i, 7–13). That "Day of Yahweh" is a day of darkness and terror, from which no wicked will be able to escape (i, 14–18). In the opening verses of chap. ii (which perhaps form a distinct oracle) the prophet urges the people to repent and to seek Yahweh before the day of retribution (ii, 1–3). Then he utters oracles against the Philistines (4–7), Moab and Ammon (8–10), Ethiopia (12), and even Ninive, the proud capital of Assyria (13–15). This is followed by the threatened doom of Jerusalem, sinfully ungrateful, incapable of taking warning from the example of the neighboring peoples (iii, 1–8).

In the second part of the book (iii, 9–20) threatenings give place to promises. There is first the promise that Yahweh shall be named and worshipped among the nations (iii, 9, 10). In the next place (11–13), Sion is promised the deliverance of a purified remnant, "an humble and poor people" who will

[1] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introd., p. 254.
[2] Cfr. I Kings xvi, 5.

Digitized by Google

serve the God of Israel in sincerity and in safety. "The book closes with a triumphant call to the people to rejoice in Yahweh who dwells in their midst, and who gives to them a high and honorable place among the nations (14–20)." [1] As justly remarked by Vigouroux,[2] "the general tone of the end of the book of Sophonias is prophetical, though it does not contain any trait which would refer directly to the person of Our Saviour."

3. Date and Authorship of the Prophecy. The title of the book refers the prophecy to "Sophonias, in the days of Josias, the son of Amon, king of Juda." These traditional date and authorship are admitted for the first chapter by practically all scholars, even by those who do not regard the title as an original part of the book. It is also commonly held that this chapter should be dated within the first half of Josias' reign, before the Discovery of the Book of the Law, in 621 B.C. The idolatrous practices described in i, 4–6, and the moral and social condition of Juda depicted in i, 8, 9, 12, point obviously to the period when Josias had not yet reached the age to initiate,[3] or at least had not yet actually started, the various reforms which, as we know, followed closely on the Discovery of the Deuteronomic Law.

As regards the rest of the book, there is hardly a verse concerning the date and authorship of which doubts have not been raised. Only three passages, however, of chaps. ii, iii can be seriously questioned; these are: (1) ii, 8–11; (2) iii, 9, 10;

[1] J. A. SELBIE, art. Zephaniah in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. iv, p. 975.

[2] Manuel Biblique, vol. ii no. 1104.

[3] The expression "the king's sons" in Sophon. i, 8 is no insuperable objection to that view, as if it implied that Josias was over 21 years of age at the time. The expression, as it stands, may mean simply the members of the royal family, besides, the reading "the king's *house*" in the LXX Version is most likely the original formula.

Digitized by Google

(3) iii, 14–20. "The oracle against Moab and Ammon (ii, 8–10) denounces these peoples for an attitude towards Juda which seems out of place in Josias' reign; their territories were not on the line of the Scythian invasion of Egypt *via* Philistia and, further, the verses are not, like those that precede and that follow, in the *qinah* measure.[1] This last circumstance tells very strongly against their originality. Then verse 11, if it belongs to Sophonias at all, is certainly out of place. The omission of these four verses gives a good connection between verse 7 and verse 12." [2]

The chief difficulty against iii, 9–10 is that these two verses seem to interrupt the connection and to interfere with the antithesis between verse 8 and verse 11.

But it is more particularly iii, 14–20 which reads like a passage which did not originally form a part of the book of Sophonias. "It appears to belong to a different situation. Instead of threatening a universal judgment on Jew, and Gentile, as alike guilty before God, the writer promises to Sion that Yahweh 'will deal with all those that afflict her' (verse 19). Of those belonging to Sion there are also some 'who sorrow far away from the solemn assembly,' and a promise is given that they shall be 'gathered' (18, 20). Further, the 'judgments' on Israel seem to have already fallen and to lie behind the prophet (15), while before him there is the vision of a glorious day about to dawn. The situation is very similar to that which appears in Isai. xl sqq. The language of the passage, too, is not without similarities to those chapters of Isaias, *e.g.*, 'sing' (14), 'fear not' (16), and other expressions. There is a great contrast between the jubilant tone of verses 14–20 and that of verses 11–13, which is very sombre. In ii, 1–13 the profound moral feeling of the prophet, his sense

[1] The *qinah* measure is the Hebrew elegiac metre.
[2] J. A. SELBIE, loc. cit., p. 976.

Digitized by Google

of the sin of his people and of the severity of the judgments needful to change them, colors his picture of their final felicity (11–13)." [1]

Despite the weight of some of the foregoing arguments, especially of those urged against iii, 14–20, many scholars still ascribe the whole book to Sophonias (ab. 626–621 B.C.).

4. Literary Characteristics and Condition of the Text of the Book of Sophonias. As far as can be judged from the oracles which most critics consider as the work of Sophonias, the style of that prophet resembles that of his contemporary, Jeremias. It is generally clear and forcible, and the figures used are at times very striking (cfr. i, 12, 17 sq.). The description of the Day of Yahweh (i, 15–18) is powerful and has visibly inspired the author of the *Dies iræ.* Other passages, such for instance as iii, 11–13, are remarkable for their literary beauty. It cannot be denied, however, that in his description of the future ruin of Ninive Sophonias lacks the graphic power of the prophet Nahum, who almost depicts the event as if it had been given him to witness it. He is often supposed to have freely used oracles of predecessors. In passages assigned to a later date than the seventh century, traces of late Hebrew have been discovered.[2]

In regard to the condition of the text of the prophecy, it is certainly defective in several places. Marginal notes have crept into the text and now appear as a third parallel line, or even under the form of distichs. Suspicious words are time and again pointed out by critics, and in some cases the primitive reading can be restored with the help of the Septuagint Version.

[1] A. B. DAVIDSON, Zephaniah, p. 103 sq.—The tendency among critics is to regard iii, 14–20 as a post-exilic lyric in the style of the Deutero-Isaias.

[2] Cfr. J. A. SELBIE, loc. cit., p. 976.

Digitized by Google

§ 4. *The Prophet Habacuc.*

1. Meaning of his Name. Legends concerning him. Nothing is known for certain of the third and last minor prophet of the seventh century, beyond his name, Habacuc, and the scanty information which may be gathered from his book. Even the exact meaning of the name, Habacuc, is a matter of discussion. It is usually taken to mean "embrace," and when its doubly intensive form—from the root *habhaq*—is taken into account, "ardent embrace." [1] It is possible, however, that the abstract "embrace" was used for object of embrace, in which case the word would signify "darling, delight." [2] According to Fr. Delitzsch, the name of the prophet is derived from the Assyrian *ḥambakuḳu*, which designates some garden plant.

Besides Habacuc's name, hardly anything concerning him can be gathered from his book. He is indeed called twice in it "the prophet," [3] which possibly implies that he held a recognized position as prophet, but this gives us practically no distinct knowledge of himself. Again, in iii, 19 we read the statement "for the chief musician, on my stringed instruments," [4] which, according to some, suggests that Habacuc was a member of the Temple choir, and consequently a Levite. This twofold inference, however, is far from certain. Instead of the pronoun "my," the Septuagint has the more probable reading "his" (referring to the chief musician); and it may

[1] St. JEROME, in the Pref. to his Commentary on the prophet, renders the name, Habacuc, by "amplexatio."

[2] Cfr. A. B. DAVIDSON, Habakkuk (in the Cambridge Bible), p. 45.

[3] Habacuc i, 1; iii, 1.

[4] This is the exact rendering from the Hebrew.

Digitized by Google

well be doubted whether in the seventh century B.C. all the "singers" belonged necessarily to the tribe of Levi.[1]

In the absence of authentic tradition, legend has been busy about the prophet. He has been represented as the sentinel set by Isaias (cfr. Isai. xxi, 6; and Habac. ii, 1) to watch for the fall of Babylon; as the son of the Sunamite woman, whom Elias restored to life; as the author of an apocryphal work; as the son of a certain Jesus, and as belonging to the tribe of Levi. According to other accounts, he was of the tribe of Simeon, and a native of Bethsocher. It is said also that when Nabuchodonosor came to destroy Jerusalem, in the time of Sedecias, Habacuc fled to Ostrakine (now Straki, on the Egyptian coast), whence he returned after the Chaldæans had withdrawn and the Jews had fled into Egypt; that he was a husbandman in his native place, and died two years before the exiles came back from Babylon. Three or four different sites have been mentioned as the place of his burial.

2. Contents of the Book of Habacuc. The book of Habacuc is commonly divided into two parts: the one (i, 2–ii) "constructed dramatically, in the form of an alternate discourse between Yahweh and His prophet";[2] the other (iii) as a lyric ode, with the usual characteristics of a psalm. As the statement of the contents of the first part depends largely upon the interpretation admitted, we give the three main exegetical views with an analysis according to each.[3]

[1] In the story of Bel and the Dragon (Dan. xiv, 32 sqq.) the prophet Habacuc is described as is stated in chap. xiii of the present volume, as carrying a meal to Daniel in the lion's den.

[2] DRIVER, Introduct. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 336.

[3] The exposition of these views is borrowed from W. H. BENNETT's Biblical Introduction, p. 252 sq.

Digitized by Google

I. FIRST VIEW: Juda's sin will be punished by the Chaldæans, who in their turn will be punished.[1]

Analysis of chaps. i, 2–ii *according to this First View:*

- i, 1–4. Social corruption of Juda, in which the righteous Jew (*Çaddiq*), is oppressed by the wicked Jew (*Rasha'*).
- i, 5–11. The destructive might of the Chaldæans, who are raised up to punish the wicked Jews.
- i, 12–17. Appeal to Yahweh against the unmeasured cruelty of the Chaldæans, the wicked, *rashá'*, who are even less righteous, *Çaddiq*, than the Jews.
- ii, 1–4. Deliverance promised.
- ii, 5–20. Woes against the Chaldæans for their cruelty, debauchery, and idolatry.

Criticism of this View: This view takes the text just as it stands, but involves the following difficulties: The "wicked" is in one place a portion of the Jews, in another the Chaldæans. i, 5–11 breaks the connection; i, 6 the Chaldæans are a new power to be raised up; in ii, 5–20 the oppressors are spoken of as well known and of long standing.

II. SECOND VIEW: Nothing is said of the sin of Juda; the prophet dwells on the wrongs done to Juda and other nations by the Chaldæans, and announces the coming chastisement of the oppressor; chap. i, 5–11 is either a later addition,[2] or to be placed before i, 1–4.[3]

[1] This interpretation is the one most received among critics.
[2] WELLHAUSEN, etc.
[3] GIESEBRECHT, etc.

Digitized by Google

Analysis of First Part according to the Second View:

- [i, 5–11. Chaldæan oppression.]
- i, 1–4. Social disorder in Juda, sufferings of righteous (*Çaddiq*), Jews, at the hands of the wicked (*Rashá*), Chaldæans.
- i, 5–17. Interpolated expansion of the picture of Chaldæan cruelty.
- i, 12–17. Appeal against the wicked Chaldæans on behalf of the righteous Jews.
- ii, 1–4. Deliverance.
- ii, 5–20. Woes against the Chaldæans.

Criticism of Second View: The chief objection to this view is that i, 5–11 neither furnishes a suitable exordium, nor seems a probable interpolation.

III. THIRD VIEW: Nothing is said of the sin of Juda; the prophet dwells on the wrongs inflicted either by the Assyrians[1] or by the Egyptians.[2] The oppressor in his turn is to be punished by the Chaldæans; chap. i, 5–11 is to be placed after ii, 4.

Analysis of First Part according to the Third View:

- i, 1–4. Sufferings of the righteous Jews at the hands of the wicked Assyrians or Egyptians.
- i, 12–17. Appeal against the wicked oppressor on behalf of the righteous Jews.
- ii, 1–4. Deliverance.
- i, 5–11. Through the prowess of the Chaldæans.
- ii, 5–20. Woes against the oppressor, Assyrian or Egyptian.

Criticism of Third View: The chief objections to this view are the difficulty of accounting for the transposition of i, 5–11;[3] and the absence of any mention of the Assyrians or Egyptians.[4] The part or whole of ii, 9–20 is considered by Kuenen, etc., not to be Habacuc's.

[1] K. BUDDE, etc.

[2] G. A. SMITH, etc.

[3] For BUDDE's answer to this objection, see Fred. T. KELLY, in the Amer. Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Jan. 1902, p. 98.

[4] Cfr. BUDDE's grounds, art. Habakkuk, in CHEYNE, Encyclop. Biblica. vol. ii, col. 1923.

Digitized by Google

The second part of the book (chap. iii) bears the title: "A prayer of Habacuc the prophet to the music of *Shigionoth.*" In reality this title applies only to verse 2, which alone is strictly a *prayer*. The following verses 3–15 depict a Theophany as a great tempest in the heavens in the midst of which Yahweh is present; while the concluding part of the ode (16–19) describes the effect which the contemplation of Yahweh's approaching manifestation produced upon the heart of the prophet. Appended to the lyric ode is the statement: "For the chief musician, on my stringed instruments."

The poetical form of the contents of the book of Habacuc is now granted by scholars at large.[1] In the concluding ode (Habac. iii), as in many psalms, the strophical structure is made apparent by the word "Selah" (verses 3, 9, 13), and the division into strophes can still be made out with great probability.[2] The same thing may be said—though this is not yet generally admitted by critics—in regard to chaps. i and ii of the prophecy.[3]

3. Date and Authorship of the Prophecy. Until quite recently, the traditional authorship embodied in the title to the book of Habacuc was undisputed. It was thought that both parts of the prophecy reflect the conditions of the closing period of the Jewish monarchy, and that the common author is Habacuc, a contemporary of the prophet Jeremias. In the present day, the traditional authorship of chap. iii is greatly controverted, and that of chap. i, 5–11 is questioned, or given up, by some prominent scholars.

The chief objections to the composition of chap. iii by the prophet Habacuc may be briefly stated as follows. First,

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii no. 1100; TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 323. A. B. DAVIDSON; DRIVER; etc.

[2] Cfr. A. CONDAMIN, S.J., in "La Revue Biblique," Jan. 1899.

[3] Cfr. The Strophic Structure of Habakkuk, by Fred. T. KELLY, in the Amer. Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Jan. 1902, pp. 94–119.

Digitized by Google

the title to the chapter, and the musical directions in iii, 3, 9, 13, 19, resemble closely those which are found in the Psalter, and imply that the ode once belonged to a liturgical collection, and was placed here by a compiler. It cannot well be supposed that, though an integrant part of the prophecy, the poem was used in liturgical services and therefore provided with its musical directions, for "such a use of any part of a prophetic book has no parallel." [1] Much more probable it is, because more natural, to admit that the hymn was excepted from a collection of sacred songs and appended to the book of Habacuc because it had already been ascribed to him in a title, just as certain psalms are still referred in the Septuagint and the Vulgate to some prophets (cfr. Ps. cxlv).

In the second place, the passage is apparently unconnected with the prophecy, chaps. i, ii. "To the circumstances of Habacuc's own age, so clearly reflected in i, 2–ii, 8, there are here no allusions; the community is the speaker (verses 14, 18, 19), it trusts that Yahweh will interpose on its behalf; but the descriptions are general, there is no specific reference to the Chaldæans; it complains in part of other needs (verse 17) and encourages itself upon other grounds, and in another way, than the prophet who speaks in i, 2–ii, 8." [2]

Lastly, the application of the term Messias (*anointed*) to the people (iii, 13) seems post-exilic. It suggests that the royal house of Juda has no longer an actual king, to whom the pre-exilic title of Yahweh's anointed should be given. In the absence of a monarch to inherit the promises made to David, the people is conceived as the inheritor of them all, as in the Deutero-Isaias (Isai. lv, 3–5), and spoken of as the *anointed* of Yahweh.[3]

[1] A. B. Davidson, Habakkuk, p. 58.
[2] Driver, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 339.
[3] Cfr. Karl Budde, art. Habakkuk, in Cheyne, Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii. col. 1928.

Digitized by Google

In view of these grounds against the traditional authorship of Habacuc's chap. iii, Driver writes in his usual guarded manner: "There is force in these arguments, and we may agree with Prof. Davidson (Habakkuk, p. 58 sq.) that the conclusion to which they point may not improbably be correct." [1]

Of the first part of the book (chaps. i, ii) chiefly chap. i, 5–11 is regarded by some critics as a piece later in date than Habacuc's time. Its character as a later addition is inferred from (1) the fact that it breaks the connection between i, 4 and i, 12; (2) the opposition between i, 6, "I raise up the Chaldæans," etc., which seems to refer to the first entrance of that people upon the stage of history, and ii, 5–20, which supposes these oppressors of Israel as well known to all; (3) the many parallels between i, 5–11 and i, 1–4, 12–17, which would lead to the conclusion that the two sections are not by the same author. It is plain, however, that these arguments against the traditional authorship of i, 5–11 are not decisive. It may be supposed that this section does not fit logically after i, 4 simply because it was written by Habacuc at a much earlier date, viz., when the Chaldæans had not yet appeared upon the stage of history. As regards the close parallels which exist between i, 5–11 and i, 1–4; i, 12–17, it may be admitted that they are due to the writer's desire to accentuate his message: as the oppressor has done to others, so shall he himself be treated, or even with greater severity.[2] But "even if chap. i, 5–11 is omitted, there is still sufficient ground for regarding Habacuc as a contemporary of Jeremias." [3]

To whatever date Habacuc's prophecies be ascribed, their Messianic import must be admitted.[4]

[1] DRIVER loc. cit. See also DRIVER'S art. on Habakkuk, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible vol. ii, p. 271.
[2] Cfr. Fred. T. KELLY, loc. cit., p. 108.
[3] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 251.
[4] Cfr. TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 324, etc.

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XVII.

THE POST-EXILIC MINOR PROPHETS: AGGEUS, ZACHARIAS, MALACHIAS.

I. HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPHETS AGGEUS AND ZACHARIAS.

II. THE PROPHET AGGEUS:

1. Meaning of his Name. Traditions concerning Him.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - The Four Prophecies (i; ii, 1–10; ii, 11–20; ii, 21–24).
   - Messianic Import of ii, 7–8 ('Veniet Desideratus cunctis gentibus").
3. Style, Date, and Authorship of the Book.

III. THE PROPHET ZACHARIAS:

1. His Name. Legendary details concerning Him.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - Chaps. i–viii: Introduction.—Eight Visions, with an Appendix; Abolition of Fasts.
   - Chaps. ix–xiv: The Two Burdens.
3. Date and Authorship
   - of the First Part: Traditional View accepted by all (i–viii).
   - of the Second Part: Arguments *pro* and *against* the Traditional View (ix–xiv .

IV. THE PROPHET MALACHIAS:

1. Name and Historical Circumstances of the Prophet.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - General Object.
   - Leading Ideas pointed out.
3. Literary Style and Approximate Date of the Prophecy.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVII.

THE POST-EXILIC MINOR PROPHETS: AGGEUS, ZACHARIAS, MALACHIAS.

§ 1. *Historical Introduction to the Prophets Aggeus and Zacharias.*

THE enthusiasm of the Jews who had longed for the Return to the land of their ancestors was naturally very great when Cyrus, on his capture of Babylon, issued his decree for their deliverance. Gathered together under the leadership of Zorobabel, a descendant of their great King David, they started unmindful of the length and difficulties of the road before them, encouraged by the priests and levites who accompanied them. They justly looked upon themselves as the "Remnant" spoken of by their prophets, and had but one wish at heart, viz.: that of restoring to its primitive splendor the Jewish theocracy. Even the ruins of the Holy City and its Temple, and the lamentable condition of southern Palestine which they beheld upon their arrival in the "Old Country," did not temper their ardor. Their return had been chiefly prompted by a religious impulse, and this is why, soon after they had effected their settlement, the religious and civil authorities of the nation gathered the people to witness the setting up of an altar to the God of Israel and the renewed offering of the morning and evening sacrifices on the first day of the seventh month. The great Festival

Digitized by Google

of the Tabernacles was also celebrated with due solemnity and the various legal holidays were henceforth observed with strict faithfulness (Esdr. iii, 1–6). A step towards the restoration of the Temple had already been taken in the form of generous contributions towards the rebuilding of the House of Yahweh on its former site (Esdr. ii, 68, 69). It was not, however, before "the second month of the second year of their coming" that the first stone of the "second" Temple—called also the Temple of Zorobabel—was formally laid. One of the causes of the delay was most likely the fear lest the work of reconstruction should be interfered with by the unfriendly neighbors of the new Jewish commonwealth; and in point of fact the returned exiles were not able to proceed beyond this purely formal ceremony till the sixteenth year of the Return.[1] The mixed races which dwelt in Samaria apparently made overtures to the supreme council of the Jews, that they also might be allowed to share in the great work of rebuilding the Temple of Yahweh; but they were refused. Whereupon the Samaritans resorted to every means to prevent the progress of the national temple of their neighbors. Not satisfied with interfering directly with the workmen of Juda, they exerted all their influence with the king of Persia, and in consequence "the work of the House of Yahweh, in Jerusalem, was interrupted" until the reign of Darius I. (Esdr. iv, 1–5, 24).

Besides this hatred and actual opposition of the people of Samaria, other circumstances may be pointed out which contributed to make it practically impossible for the Jews to pursue the work of erecting the House of Yahweh. "The invasion of Egypt by Cambyses in 527 B.C. must have brought with it great sufferings for the Jewish colonists; no peace or

[1] Cfr. DRIVER, Introd., p. 547; G. A. COOKE, art. Haggai, in HASTINGS' Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 279.

Digitized by Google

security was possible while Palestine was overrun by the vast hordes of the Persian army on their way to Egypt (cfr. Agg. i, 6; Zach. viii, 10). A succession of bad seasons followed; the land suffered from prolonged drought; harvest and vintage failed; the fortunes of the colony sank to their lowest ebb (Agg. i, 6, 9–11; ii, 16, 17). In Jerusalem itself some of the old social abuses made their appearance; luxury and self-seeking among the wealthier classes took the place of zeal for the cause of religion (Agg. i, 4, 9). The leaders of the community did nothing, the first enthusiasm had cooled down, and the great object of the Return remained unaccomplished. Meanwhile important events were taking place in the Persian empire. During the early years of his reign (521–515) Darius was engaged in a desperate struggle to secure the kingdom he had won. Province after province revolted; rebellions broke out everywhere, now in the very heart of the empire, now in its farthest extremities. While Darius was suppressing the Babylonian usurper Nidintubel, Elam and the neighboring countries attempted to throw off the Persian yoke. At the beginning of 520 B.C. Darius subdued Babylon, and then marched against the Median pretender Phraortes; but before this campaign was over, Babylon revolted a second time. It seemed like a vast upheaval of the heathen world, a shaking of the heavens and earth. There were still prophets in Jerusalem to read the signs of the times, and they were not slow to grasp the bearing of these vast movements upon the interests which they had at heart. The central authority was weakened; the original permit of Cyrus had not been repealed: now was the opportunity for a religious and patriotic enterprise. Aggeus came forward in 520—and Zacharias was soon by his side—with the divine command to start at once upon the rebuilding of the Temple. The neglect of this first duty, so the prophet

Digitized by Google

insists, has been the cause of all the recent misfortunes; but when once it has been discharged, the divine blessing will descend and the glorious promises of the great prophet of the Restoration (Isai. lx) will be fulfilled at last."[1]

§ 2. *The Prophet Aggeus* (*520 B.C.*).

1. Meaning of his Name. Traditions concerning him. The first prophet who thus urged the Jews to rebuild the Temple of Yahweh is called in the Hebrew Text *Ḥaggai*, and in the Septuagint Ἀγγαῖος, whence the Vulgate name *Aggeus*. The exact meaning of the word is uncertain: while many scholars consider it as an adjective signifying "the festive one," or perhaps "one born on the feast-day," others take it as an abbreviation of *Ḥaggiah*, "my feast is Yahweh," a Jewish proper name found in I Chron. vi, 15 (Vulg., I Paralip. vi, 30). In view of similar forms—*Mattenai* (II Esdr. xii, 19; I Esdr. x, 33; etc.), *Zabbai* (I Esdr. x, 28; etc.), which are abbreviations of proper names ending in *iah*—the second meaning of *Haggai* (Aggeus) seems the more probable one.[2]

Similar uncertainty prevails in regard to the personal history of Aggeus. Outside the few details which can be gathered from a comparison between certain passages of his prophecy i, 1; ii, 1, 10, 20 with Esdras v, 1; vi, 14, and which simply mention the various occasions on which he came out to deliver his message, all that can be stated concerning him is drawn from groundless traditions. According to these legends, Aggeus was born in Babylon, was a young man when he came to Jerusalem, and was buried in the Holy City among the priests, whence it has been inferred that he was of the

[1] G. A. Cooke, loc. cit.

[2] H. V. Hilprecht has found the Jewish name *Ḥagga* on a tablet of the fifth century B.C. from Nippur.

Digitized by Google

family of Aaron. Some, taking in its literal sense the expression "Aggeus, the *Mal'akh* of Yahweh" (i, 13), have imagined that he was an angel in human form. According to Jewish writers, Aggeus, Zacharias, and Malachias were the men who were with Daniel when he saw the vision related in Dan. x, 7; and were, after the Exile, members of the so-called Great Synagogue. According to a Talmudic tradition, their death is to be placed in the fifty-second year of the Medes and Persians; while, according to another, Aggeus survived till the entry of Alexander the Great into Jerusalem, and even till the time of Our Saviour. According to Pseudo-Epiphanius, he was the first who chanted the Alleluia in the "second" Temple; etc.[1] From all this one can learn the value usually to be set on so-called Jewish traditions, which are most full and explicit when all historical basis is wanting.

2. Contents of the Book of Aggeus. The prophecies of Aggeus are arranged in four groups, each one headed by the date on which it was delivered. The first utterance (i, 1–11) urges the people to rebuild the Temple, which thev have neglected, satisfied as they were with the comfort of their own houses. The drought which desolates the land is a punishment of their selfish neglect. Coupled with this first utterance is a brief narrative (i, 12–14) setting forth the effect which the prophecy produced upon the leaders and the people of Israel: three weeks later, work was started on the House of Yahweh. In his second utterance (ii, 1–10) the prophet promises that the new Temple, which then appeared as nothing in comparison with that of Solomon,

[1] G. A. COOKE, loc. cit., p. 281; SMITH, Bible Dict., vol. ii. p. 979 (Amer. Edit.).—Father VIGOUROUX (Manuel Biblique, vol. ii. no. 1105) says: "According to the Fathers, Aggeus was one of the Babylonian captives who came back with Zorobabel." Whence TROCHON significantly inquires: "On what ground rest such traditions?" (les Petits Prophètes, p. 373, footn. 2).

Digitized by Google

would one day be incomparably more glorious. The third utterance (ii, 11–20) declares that as long as the Temple is unbuilt the Jews are as men who are unclean, and whose gifts are unwelcome: hence the late unfruitful seasons. Their renewed zeal, however, will secure them a divine blessing. The fourth, and last, utterance (ii, 21–24) announces that, in the approaching overthrow of the heathen powers, Zorobabel will receive special tokens of Yahweh's favor and protection.

Several passages of these short prophetical utterances are justly regarded as having a Messianic import. This is unquestionably the case with ii, 7–8 (Heb. ii, 6–7), which announces that the second Temple will exceed in glory that of Solomon, although, in rendering verse 8 by

Et movebo omnes Gentes, et *veniet Desideratus cunctis Gentibus,*

the Vulgate ascribes to the passage a direct reference to the person of the Messias, which is alien from the Original Text.[1] The strict rendering of the Hebrew is:

Et movebo omnes Gentes, et *venient desiderium omnium Gentium,*

so that "St. Jerome, in the Vulgate Version, has rendered Agg. ii, 7 (Vulg. ii, 8) somewhat incorrectly. For (1) *venient desiderium* does not refer to a person, but as the verb is plural and the noun singular, the latter must be taken in a collective sense; (2) the abstract *desiderium*, 'desire,' is put in phrases of this kind for the object of desire, and signifies *what is desirable, precious things, treasures*, as may be seen by comparing I Sam. ix, 20; Gen. xlix, 26; II Chron. xxxii, 27; Jerem. xxv, 34; Osee xiii, 15; Nahum ii, 10 (Vulg. ii, 9); (3) the subject which lies at the foundation of the prophecy is *the splendor of the Temple;* (4) the series of the discourse requires that the

[1] This is freely admitted by JAHN, KNABENBAUER, S.J., PHILIPPE, TROCHON and many other Catholic writers.

Digitized by Google

seventh (eighth in the Vulg.) verse should be explained as referring to the *riches and magnificence of the Temple.*[1] The meaning is therefore this: that the Temple should be rendered very magnificent by the accession of the treasures of the Gentiles."[2] Thus understood the prophecy is in substantial agreement with Isai. lx, 5 sqq., and other passages of the Old Testament, the reference of which to Messianic times cannot be questioned. "The only objection to that interpretation is that it does away with a commonly received Messianic argument. But, besides the fact that, thus understood, the passage refers still to the time, though not to the person,—at least directly,—of the Messias, truth must always prevail over mere apologetical interest."[3]

3. Style, Date, and Authorship. The style of Aggeus is suited to the practical character of the contents of his prophecy. Each of the four reasons he appeals to in order to convince his contemporaries that they must rebuild without delay the House of Yahweh is well calculated to bring home to them this conviction. And the same thing may be said in reference to the literary style in which these reasons are set forth. Aggeus' style is, as a rule, simple and unpruned. It is always direct and natural, and its repetitions prove "evidently that the notes of Aggeus' discourses have not been touched up by a more literary writer."[4] Although it usually appears "tame and prosaic"[5] when compared with the flights of imagination and the poetical power

[1] Cfr. in particular Agg. ii. 4, 9. 10.

[2] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 425 (Engl. Transl.).—For a valuable paraphrase of the passage and its context, see T. T. PEROWNE, Haggai (in the Camb. Bible), p. 38.

[3] Abbé E. PHILIPPE art. Aggée, in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, col. 269 sq. See also G. A. COOKE, loc. cit., p. 280 and footn.

[4] W. R. SMITH, art. Haggai, in CHEYNE Encyclop. Biblica, vol. ii, col. 1937.

[5] W. A. WRIGHT, art. Haggai, in SMITH, Bible Dict., vol. ii, p. 979.

Digitized by Google

evidenced by such writers as Isaias, Amos, etc., it is not devoid of force, and "not unfrequently the thoughts shape themselves into parallel clauses such as are usual in Hebrew poetry."[1]

Besides this harmony of the style with the contents of the book of Aggeus, strong internal data concur to confirm the traditional date and authorship of that inspired writing. The four utterances are directly concerned with what was of paramount religious importance for the Jewish community about 520 B.C., and what, as it can be inferred from the complications of secular history already mentioned, had gradually become possible at that precise period, viz., the rebuilding of the House of Yahweh. The shaking of the heavens and the earth, and the overthrow of nations spoken of in the second chapter of the prophecy, can naturally be considered as a reflection of the distracted condition of the heathen world at the time. Yea, more: the whole description is actually associated by the writer with the immediate circumstances of time and place in the midst of which the prophecy regarding the Messianic times was delivered: Zorobabel, the great Jewish leader of the Return, the scion of David, is still living, and is distinctly made sure of Yahweh's favor and protection amidst dangers present and future. Together with this local coloring which connects intimately the book of Aggeus with the time assigned to it by tradition, each part of the prophecy is supplied with such precise dates,[2] and ascribed so explicitly to Aggeus, that each utterance may be said to bear within itself the manifest mark that it was written soon after its delivery. It has been held, however, by some scholars that since "the book frames these utterances in a

[1] DRIVER, Introduction, p. 344.

[2] The first utterance is assigned to September, the second to Octobe. and the third and fourth to December, 520 B.C.

Digitized by Google

very brief narrative and Aggeus is spoken of throughout in the third person, it may have been compiled by the prophet himself or by one of his hearers." [1]

§ 3. *The Prophet Zacharias.*

1. His Name. Legendary Details concerning him. The prophet who worked together with Aggeus to secure the rebuilding of the House of Yahweh is called Zacharias in the Septuagint and the Vulgate Versions. His Hebrew name, *Zechariah*, is an abbreviation of *Zechariahu* (cfr. IV Kings xv, 8) and means more probably, not "memory of Yahweh," as explained by St. Jerome, but "whom Yahweh remembers," or simply "Yahweh remembers." [2]

Of the prophet Zacharias, as of his colleague Aggeus, very little is known. The title to his book speaks of him as "the son of Barachias, the son of Addo," whereby is very likely meant that he was the *grandson* of Addo, although in I Esdras v, 1; vi, 14 he is called "the son of Addo." Apparently the writer of I Esdras uses the word "son" in its less restricted sense of descendant, passing over Barachias, who possibly died early and without distinction, while the prophet himself gives us, as it might well be expected, the exact order of descent.[3] It is also commonly admitted that, since the Zacharias and Addo mentioned in the title of the prophecy are probably identical with those that are spoken of in Nehem. xii, 4, 16, among the priests of the time Zacharias was both a priest and a prophet.

[1] W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 255.

[2] Cfr. TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 393, footn. 1; Chas. H. H. WRIGHT Zechariah and his Prophecies, p. xx sq.

[3] This natural explanation disposes (1) of St. JEROME's conjecture that the same person is called both "son of Barachias" and "son of Addo"; (2) of KNOBEL's supposition (adopted by Bleek, Wellhausen, etc.) that the present title points to a composite authorship of the book, referring it to two Zacharias,—the one "son of Barachias," and the other "son of Addo."

Digitized by Google

But in the absence of authentic tradition, legend has been busy about Zacharias. He is supposed by Jewish rabbis to have been a member of the so-called Great Synagogue, and to have lived to a good old age. According to Christian legendary accounts, — those of the Pseudo-Epiphanius, Dorotheus, etc.,—Zacharias was a very old man when he came from Babylon, where he had uttered prophecies and worked miracles. He is said to have foretold to Salathiel the birth and future career of Zorobabel. He is also said to have predicted to Cyrus his victory over Crœsus, as well as what Cyrus accomplished at Jerusalem. He died in Judæa in extreme old age and was buried near Aggeus. To all this Dorotheus adds that Zacharias' tomb was near Eleutheropolis, and that he was the Zacharias the son of Barachias mentioned by Isaias (chap. viii). The last statement involved indeed a gross anachronism, but this did not matter much to its author so long as he knew he was voicing a Jewish tradition. Equally untrustworthy is the statement of Hesychius to the effect that Zacharias was of the tribe of Levi and was born in Galaad.[1]

2. Contents of the Book of Zacharias. The prophecy of Zacharias is usually divided into two main parts: chaps. i–viii; chaps. ix–xiv. The first opens with an introductory call to repentance based on the fulfilment of ancient prophecy (i, 1–6); the Jews are bidden not to imitate their forefathers who neglected the warnings of the former prophets. This introduction is followed by a series of eight symbolical visions (i, 7–vi, 8), which are granted to the prophet and explained to him on each occasion by the *angelus interpres*. "Resting on the then present circumstances of the Jews, as its historical basis, the prophecy of these visions deals

[1] Cfr. TROCHON, loc. cit., p. 394 sq.; Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, loc. cit., p. xvi sqq.

Digitized by Google

chiefly with the immediate future—the rebuilding of the Temple and city, the repeopling of the land, the restoration of the Temple-service, the purifying of the nation; while, at the same time, both by the pregnant terms of its predictions in all these particulars, and by the vistas which from time to time it opens up in its course, it reaches forth unmistakably towards a more distant goal."[1] A similar intimate connection with the circumstances of the time, and apparently, also, a similar typical import, should be ascribed to vi, 9–15, which seems to be a historical appendix to the preceding visions. In it we are told how Zacharias complied with a divine command to take of the silver and gold brought to Jerusalem by Babylonian exiles as offerings to the Temple, to make therewith crowns for the high priest, Jesus,[2] and then to hang them up for a memorial in the House of Yahweh. "By this significant action it was intimated that the Temple then in progress, in which those crowns were hung, should be finished and adorned in the coming time with gifts and offerings; but also that another Priest should in due course arise, who should be a king as well, and who in a truer and higher sense should build the Temple of Yahweh."[3] The first part closes with a prophetical answer concerning the observance of fasts. The men of Bethel had inquired whether the fast of the fifth month in memory of the destruction of the Temple should be still kept. In his answer the prophet lays down the principle that Yahweh loves mercy rather than fasting, and that their forefathers have perished through neglect of the moral commands of the Lord. He then adds

[1] T. T. PEROWNE, Zechariah (in the Cambridge Bible), p. 59.

[2] Instead of "crowns" many interpret "a crown"; and instead of "Jesus," several scholars think that we should read "Zorobabel." The present Hebrew text of the passage is most likely defective (cfr. W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introd., p. 257).

[3] PEROWNE, loc. cit., p. 59 sq.—Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1110; WRIGHT, loc. cit., p. 147 sqq.

Digitized by Google

a glowing picture of the Messianic future, when the fasts of the past will be turned into festivals, and all nations worship together with the Jews the God of Israel (chaps. vii, viii).

The second part of the prophecy (chaps. ix–xiv) is made up of two leading sections which begin abruptly and with no preface beyond the title: "The burden of the word of Yahweh" (ix, 1; xii, 1). The first "burden" (ix–xi, with which, it is probable, xiii, 7–9 should be connected) opens with an oracle (ix, 1–8) against the Syrian, Phœnician, and Philistine cities, which introduces the Messianic king as prince of peace. "Juda and Ephraim shall be Yahweh's instruments to destroy the sons of Javan [the Greeks]. The exiles of Ephraim shall be gathered from Egypt and Assyria and placed in Galaad and Lebanon. After Israel has suffered at the hands of evil shepherds [i.e., rulers], these shall be destroyed, and a third part of the flock shall be redeemed to be Yahweh's faithful people.

"Chaps. xii–xiii, 6 with chap. xiv are described as 'a burden of the word of Yahweh upon Israel,' which from the contents must be used, in post-exilic fashion, for Juda and Jerusalem. It describes the glory of a purified people of God in the Day of Yahweh. All nations will come against Jerusalem, but after the city has been reduced to extremity, or even captured, Yahweh will manifest Himself to destroy them. Jerusalem will be restored to prosperity, and provided with new rivers, while the residue of the Gentiles will come up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles; and all Juda and Jerusalem will be perfectly holy unto Yahweh."[1]

3. Date and Authorship. As already stated, the general contents of the first part of the book of Zacharias are intimately connected with the actual circumstances of the Jews, about 520 B.C. Like the prophecies of Aggeus, which

[1] W. H. BENNETT, a Primer of the Bible, p. 112 sq.

Digitized by Google

go back to that same period, they are so directed to encourage the returned exiles to rebuild their Temple and city, by promises of immediate success and future prosperity, that almost every paragraph is clearly found to have points of contact with B.C. 520–518. Like the prophecies of Aggeus, too, chaps. i–viii of Zacharias have their sections supplied with headings which specify the date and author. Besides, while these chapters are thus distinctly ascribed to Zacharias, they are characterized throughout by special phrases and idioms, and particularly by the use of the first person (cfr. i, 7, 18; ii, 1, 3; iii, 1; iv, 1 sqq.; v, 1 sqq.; etc.). It is not, therefore, surprising to find that all critics agree in accepting the testimony of Jewish and Christian tradition in regard to the date and authorship of the first part of the prophecy. In fact, in view of the concordant testimony of internal and external data, they most readily admit that Zacharias wrote himself chaps. i–viii soon after the latest of the prophecies contained therein.

In striking contrast with this agreement among scholars concerning the date and authorship of the first part stands their diversity of views when they endeavor to assign a probable date and author to the oracles which make up the second part of the book of Zacharias. The most prevalent theories may be reduced to three. There is, first, the traditional view, which maintains the unity of authorship for both parts of the prophecy. The same prophet, Zacharias, who wrote chaps. i–viii penned also chaps. ix–xiv, but after a long lapse of time, in old age, and under altered circumstances, so that the differences noticeable between the two portions of his work can be easily accounted for. According to a second view, the latter half of the book is to be broken into two parts, one of which (chaps. ix–xi, together with xiii, 7–9) is the work of a pre-exilic writer about the time of King Achaz (735 B.C.), possibly the "Zacharias son of Barachias" spoken

Digitized by Google

of in Isai. viii, 2, while the second (chaps. xii–xiii, 6; xiv) is the production of a prophet contemporary with Jeremias (606 B.C.), possibly "Urias son of Semei," who is said in Jerem. xxvi, 20 to have "prophesied against this city [Jerusalem] and against this land, according to all the words of Jeremias." The third opinion assigns chaps. ix–xiv, as a whole, or possibly in separate sections, to a period which is much later than the time of Zacharias, the contemporary of Aggeus, but which varies from the beginning of the third to the middle of the second century before the Christian era.[1]

The defenders of the traditional authorship appeal to both external and internal evidence in favor of their position. They claim, and indeed rightly, that in no ancient writings either of the Jews or of the Christians are there any traces of hesitation to ascribe the second part of the book, as well as the first, to the post-exilic prophet, Zacharias, the contemporary of Aggeus. Of course, it is readily granted that the testimony of Christian Fathers and Church writers simply voices Jewish tradition and therefore does not add to it any distinct value. But it is strenuously maintained that the explicit and unvarying testimony of Jewish scribes and rabbis to the unity and genuineness of the book of Zacharias is an important fact, which has a right to have its full weight in the controversy. "It is highly improbable," we are told, "that the compilers of the Canon could have been ignorant with regard to the writings of a prophet who lived so near to their own times, or that they could have easily confounded with his genuine productions the prophecies of [one or] two other prophets who lived previous to the Babylonian captivity."[2] When, therefore, they prefixed the title *Zechariah* to the

[1] Cfr. W. G. ELMSLIE, Zechariah, in "Book by Book," p. 333.
[2] Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, Zechariah and his Prophecies, p. xli. See also H. LESÊTRE, Introd. à l'Etude de l'Ecriture Sainte, vol. ii, p. 643.

Digitized by Google

present collection of prophecies, they rightly started a tradition which has not experienced any change down to the present day.

As a confirmation of this early and constant tradition, many internal data are usually pointed out. From among these the following prove that Zachar. ix–xiv were written after the Exile: (1) These chapters contain quotations from or allusions to the later prophets of the time of the Exile. For example, we find in Zachar. ix, 2 an allusion to Ezech. xxviii, 3; in ix, 5 to Sophon. ii, 4; in ix, 11 to Isai. li, 14; in ix, 12 to Isai. xlix, 9 and lxi, 7; in x, 3 to Ezech. xxxiv, 17. The whole allegory of Zachar. xi seems to be derived from Ezech. xxxiv (cfr. especially xi, 4, 16 with Ezech. xxxiv, 3, 4); xi, 3 is borrowed from Jerem. xii, 5; etc., etc. Indeed "this manifest acquaintance on the part of the writer of Zachar. ix–xiv with so many of the later prophets seemed so convincing to De Wette that, after having in the first three editions of his *Einleitung* declared for two authors, he found himself compelled to change his mind, and to admit that the later chapters must belong to the age of Zacharias, and might have been written by Zacharias himself."[1] (2) The historical standpoint in Zach. ix–xiv is post-exilic. Thus in ix, 12; x, 6 it is assumed that Juda and Israel had been in exile; in ix, 13 "the sons of Javan" [the Greeks] are mentioned as a world-power and the most formidable antagonist of Israel's theocracy; again, in xii, 12, 13, the prominence given to priests and levites is decidedly post-exilic, as is also the importance attached to the Feast of Tabernacles in xiv, 16, to the sanctity of pots and bells in xiv, 20, 21; finally, the poor present estate of the House of David in xii, 7, 8, 12; xiii, 1, together with the advanced development of the Messianic idea through-

[1] T. T. PEROWNE, art. Zechariah, in SMITH, Dict. of the Bible, vol. iv, p. 3607 (Amer. Edit.).

Digitized by Google

out the second part of the prophecy, shows that the author wrote during the period after the Return.[1]

Other intrinsic data are brought forth by the defenders of the traditional view as showing that the post-exilic author of chaps. ix–xiv is no other than the writer of chaps. i–viii, that is Zacharias, the contemporary of Aggeus: (1) The same general line of thought is followed in both parts of the book: "in both, Israel's enemies are threatened (i, 14, 15; vi, 8; ix, 1); the promised Messias will be king and priest (iii, 8; vi, 12; ix, 9–17); the nations will be converted (ii, 11; vi, 15; xiv, 16, 17); the Israelites will come back from exile (viii, 7, 8; ix, 11; x, 8 sqq.); the new kingdom will be holy and prosperous (i, 17; iii, 1–10; xiii, 1–6; xiv, 7, 11); etc.[2] (2) The same literary characteristics are found in both parts. Thus it is claimed that the style and language are practically the same, apart from the differences which are naturally entailed by the difference of subject-matter in the two. "When the prophet is describing a vision, or giving an answer to questions propounded, he naturally writes in the language best suited to his purpose, viz., prose. But when he comes to speak of the distant future, he naturally rises to a loftier style of diction; and this is the case even in the earlier chapters, when occasion requires; for instance, chaps. ii, 10–17; vi, 12, 13."[3] In point of fact, both portions are written in comparatively pure Hebrew and contain the same characteristic expressions,—such, for instance, as "passer over and turning back" (vii, 14; ix, 8), "the eye of God" (iii, 9; ix, 1); Juda; Israel; Ephraim; Joseph (i, 12, 19; viii, 15; ix, 13; x, 6, etc.), employed to designate the nation. Both parts are marked by the habit of dwelling on the same thought

[1] Cfr. H. LESÊTRE, loc. cit.. W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introd., p. 260 sq.
[2] H. LESÊTRE, loc. cit., p. 644.
[3] W. H. LOWE, Zechariah, in "Plain Introd. to the Books of the Bible, edited by ELLICOTT, vol. i, p. 345.

Digitized by Google

or word,—for instance, in chaps. ii, 10, 11 (Heb. verses 14, 15); vi, 10, 12, 13; viii, 4, 5, 23; xi, 7; xiv, 10, 11,—and of mentioning the whole and its parts for the sake of emphasis, as, for instance, in v, 4; x, 4; x, 11 sqq. (3) The unity of authorship is implied in the fact that some verses, in whole or in part, are common to the two portions of the book; compare, for instance, ii, 10 with ix, 9; ii, 6 with xiv, 5; vii, 14 with ix, 8.

The intrinsic grounds just stated in favor of the traditional authorship of Zachar. ix–xiv have been gradually gathered up from the contents of the book of Zacharias during the course of the last century, and are at the present day, in the eyes of many prominent scholars,[1] sufficient evidence that both parts of the prophecy should be ascribed to Zacharias. The tendency prevalent among critics, however, is to regard all such grounds as inadequate, and to reject the traditional view as not being in harmony with all the facts of the case. The following are the principal points most relied on to justify this rejection.

It seems, first of all, that the historical standpoint in Zachar. ix–xiv is very different from that of the preceding chapters (i–viii). In the second part of the book, Damascus, Tyre and Sidon, Philistia, Assyria, and Egypt (ix, 1–6; x, 10, 11) are denounced as the enemies of Juda. Now it is hardly probable that a Hebrew prophet contemporary of Aggeus would thus denounce cities or countries which were at the time subject to Persia equally with the Jews themselves. As regards Assyria and Egypt in particular, their representation in Zachar. x as if they were still formidable powers looks like an anachronism, Persia having absorbed the one and subdued the other. Again, the king-

[1] Among them may be mentioned KEIL, KAULEN, CORNELY, Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, LESÊTRE, etc.

Digitized by Google

dom of the ten tribes is spoken of in terms implying apparently that it still exists (ix, 10; xi, 14), a fact which points to a pre-exilic date, as does also the mention of the "Teraphim"[1] and diviners in x, 2. In like manner, the mention of a king in xi, 6 (cfr. xiii, 7) seems to make for a time other than that of Zacharias, while the fact that "in ix, 13 the Greeks ("sons of Javan") are spoken of, not as a distant, unimportant people, such as they would be either in the eighth century B.C., or in the days of Zacharias (about 520 B.C.), but as a world-power, and as Israel's greatest antagonist, the victory over whom (which is achieved only by special divine aid) inaugurates the Messianic age,"[2] distincly refers to the period after the overthrow of the Persian dominion by Alexander the Great, in 333 B.C.

In the second place, the author of chaps. i–viii evinces interests and moves in a circle of ideas so different from those which occupy the writer of chaps. ix–xiv that a diversity of authorship is naturally suggested. "That chaps. i–viii consist largely of visions of which there are none in chap. ix, might not itself be incompatible with identity of author; but the dominant ideas and representations of chaps. i–viii are very different from those of either chaps. ix–xi or chaps. xii–xiv. In chaps. i–viii the lifetime of the author and the objects of his interest—the Temple and the affairs of the restored community—are very manifest; but the circumstances and the interests of the author, whether of chaps. ix–xi or of chaps. xii–xiv, whatever obscurity may hang over particular passages, are certainly very different.[3] Zacharias

[1] The "Teraphim" were apparently idols representing either the whole or only a part of the human form, and used for oracular purposes.

[2] DRIVER. Introd. to the Literat. of Old Test., p. 349.

[3] Among other differences the following can be easily noticed. In chaps. i–viii the sections are supplied with headings which specify the date and author; the prophet speaks in the first person, and at each step alludes to the events of his time. In chaps. ix–xiv, on the contrary, the few headings that are

Digitized by Google

pictures of the Messias and the Messianic age are colored quite differently from those of chaps. ix–xi or chaps. xii–xiv (contrast iii, 8; vi, 12 sq., and chap. viii, with the representation in chap. xiv); the prospects of the nation are also represented differently (contrast i, 21; ii, 8–11; viii, 7 sq., with xii, 2 sqq.; xiv, 2 sq., and observe that in chaps. xii–xiv the *return* of the Jewish exiles is not one of the events which the prophet looks forward to)."[1] From all this it has been inferred that the author of chaps. i–viii is different from the writer of chaps. ix–xiv. As regards the supposition made by some defenders of the traditional view that all such differences point, not to a diversity of author, but only to a difference of age, the first part having been written in the youth of Zacharias, and the second in his old age, it is treated as a groundless assumption. Indeed, it is regarded as an assumption which goes contrary to the fact that the first part is precisely the one which is devoid of an elevated and imaginative style, and of the poetic fire of youth.

In the last place, the differences of diction are those to be expected from different authors. For example, the phrases "Thus saith Yahweh of hosts" (i, 3, 4, 14, 16, 17; ii, 8; iii, 7; vi, 12; viii, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 14, etc.), "the word of Yahweh came unto . . ." (i, 7; iv, 8; vi, 9; vii, 1, 4, 8; viii, 1, 18), "I lifted up my eyes and saw" (i, 18; ii, 1; v, 1; vi, 1), which appear so often in the first part, are never found in the second; while the common phrase of the second part, "In that day" (ix, 16; xi, 11; xii, 3, 4, 6 8, 9, 11; xiii, 1, 2, 4; xiv, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 20, 21), occurs only three times in the first. "The expression 'the Lord of the whole earth'

to be found are silent as to date and author: the writer seldom uses the first person, and when he does, it is not, as in the first part in his own but in some symbolic character, for instance, the good Shepherd. Again all distinct references to persons and events of the period, 520–518 B.C., have disappeared.

[1] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 354. See also Samuel DAVIDSON Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 324 sq.; etc.

Digitized by Google

in iv, 14; vi, 5, does not occur in the second part; nor the peculiar use of the word 'yet' in i, 17; viii, 4; viii, 20; nor the particle '*asher* as employed in vii, 7; viii, 17. In the first part, the enemies of the theocracy are never designated as 'the peoples round about,' as in xii, 2, 6; the ruling dynasty is not called 'the house of David' as in xii, 7, 8, 10, 12; xiii, 1; nor are princes termed 'shepherds' (x, 2, 3; xi, 8, 16; xiii, 7), and the people 'the flock' (ix, 16; x, 2; xi, 4, 7, 11, 17; xiii, 7)."[1] Finally, while in chaps. i–viii the style is generally unpoetical, and Hebrew parallelism is uncommon, in chaps. ix–xiv (except in the narrative part of chap. xi) the poetical imagery and form prevail as in the prophets generally. All such differences of style, it is argued, far more than outweigh the few features of resemblance which can be pointed out between the two parts of Zacharias, and which can hardly be considered as characteristic of a single writer, since they often occur in other prophetical books.[2]

Such are the principal grounds usually brought forth in favor of the diversity of authorship.[3] During the course of the last century they have been closely examined by both the defenders and the opponents of the traditional view,[4] with the result that, according to most contemporary scholars, these arguments have stood sufficiently well the test of criticism. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that of the Biblical scholars who look carefully and independently into the grounds *for* and *against* the traditional authorship, by far the largest

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 324.

[2] Cfr. DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 354 sq.

[3] The principal argument set forth, in 1632, by Joseph MEDE, the first opponent of the traditional authorship, was drawn from the fact that Matt. xxvii, 9 ascribes Zachar. xi, 12, 13 to JEREMIAS. This argument is now universally discarded.

[4] Perhaps the sharpest criticism of these grounds is found in Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, Zechariah and his Prophecies. See also TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 400 sqq.

Digitized by Google

number adopt the view that chaps. ix–xiv should not be ascribed to Zacharias, the contemporary of the prophet Aggeus.

But while thus agreeing as to the main question, recent scholars are much at variance in regard to the secondary question, whether chaps. ix–xiv belong to one and the same date and author, or, on the contrary, to several writers living at different periods of Jewish history. Even a rapid discussion of this interesting point of Biblical criticism would necessarily entail long and tedious details. The following general remarks must therefore be sufficient.

(1) It can hardly be doubted that chaps. ix–xiv contain allusions to both *pre-* and *post*-exilic events,[1] so that commentators who do not take into account either the *pre-* or the *post*-exilic data are obliged to resort to some forced interpretations of the text.

(2) The probabilities are that not only chaps. xii–xiv (which are generally regarded by scholars as post-exilic) but also chaps. ix–xi should be ascribed in their present form to a date after the Babylonian captivity. For, among other reasons, the manner in which prophets late in the period of the Exile are quoted throughout the second part of the book of Zacharias seems to imply a post-exilic origin.

(3) To account for the double nature of the allusions chiefly in ix–xi, two hypotheses can be made. "Either the author took up ancient oracles—pre-exilic in language and allusions—which lent themselves to his purpose, and especially in ix–xi adapted them to express the fears and hopes and faults of his own day; or else, in conformity with a literary custom of his age, or from personal reverence for what was old and venerable, he deliberately clothed his messages to his own age in an archaic dress, and framed them

[1] For references, see DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 348 sq.—Perhaps the reference to Greece in ix, 13 should not be considered as pointing necessarily to a date in the Greek period; it may be attributed to an editor.

Digitized by Google

in a more or less allegorical form."[1] Either of these suppositions is plainly in harmony with the ancient literary methods of the Eastern nations, and the first is compatible with the defined doctrine of the fact of Biblical inspiration, provided one admits that the last editor of the book was himself inspired.[2]

(4) The similarity of the three titles to Zach. ix–xi; xii–xiv; Malach. i, 1, "the burden of the word of Yahweh, . . ." is remarkable. As this expression does not occur anywhere else in the Old Testament, it seems to point to a peculiar common cause. Hence the "plausible conjecture that the three prophecies now known as Zachar. ix–xi, xii–xiv, and Malachias, coming to the compiler's hands with no authors' names prefixed, he attached the first of these at the point which his volume of the 'Minor Prophets' had reached, viz., the end of Zachar. viii, arranging the other two so as to follow this and framing titles for them (Zachar. xii, 1 and Malach. i, 1) on the model of the opening words of Zachar. ix, 1,"[3] which alone, as it appears, form an integral part of the sentence wherein they are found.

§ 4. *The Prophet Malachias.*

1. Name and Historical Circumstances of the Prophet. The name Malachias (Heb. *Mal'achi*), which in all the current editions the Old Testament is prefixed to the last book of the Minor Prophets,[4] is apparently intended as the historic proper name of a prophet. This view, adopted

[1] W. G. ELMSLIE, in "Book by Book," vol. i, p. 336. Cfr. E. KAUTZSCH, the Literature of the Old Test., p. 137 (Engl. Transl.).

[2] Of the actual inspiration of the last editor of a sacred book thus composed, we are made absolutely sure by the divine and consequently infallible authority of the living Church of Christ, which is "the ground and pillar of the truth" (I Tim. iii, 15).

[3] DRIVER, loc. cit., p. 355.

[4] The form "Malachias" is found in the Vulgate and is derived from the Septuagint Μαλαχίας, whereas the form "Malachi" appears in the Protestant Versions and comes directly from the Hebrew.

Digitized by Google

by Herbst, Keil, Trochon, Perowne, etc., has in its favor (1) the analogy of the heading with that of the other prophetical writings where the simple names Isaias, Jeremias, Nahum, etc., prefixed to the separate books, are justly regarded as the respective personal names of those prophets; (2) the wording of the inscription: "The burden of the word of Yahweh to Israel by the hand of Malachias" (Malach. i, 1), wherewith the book opens, and wherein the expression "by the hand of Malachias" seems to imply that Malachias is the real proper name of the inspired writer, and its bearer a personage well known to the readers; (3) the possibility that the Hebrew form "Mal'achi" be a contraction of *Mal'achiah*, "messenger of Yahweh," just as *'Abi* is the equivalent of *'Abiah* (cfr. IV Kings xviii, 2 with II Chron. xxix, 1).[1]

According to most recent critics the Hebrew term "Mal'achi" in i, 1 does not denote the actual name of the prophet, but his mission and office as in chap. iii, 1, so that, as already stated, the last prophetical writing of the Minor Prophets would be really anonymous. The view which thus considers the word as an appellative, meaning "my [i.e., Yahweh's] messenger," is embodied in the old rendering of i, 1 in the LXX Version, *Λῆμμα λόγου Κυρίου ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ*, "a rendering which would hardly have been possible at a time when the existence of a prophet Malachias was generally recognized."[2] It has moreover in its favor, not only the silence of Josephus regarding Malachias, though he mentions Aggeus and Zacharias, but also the prevailing tradition among the Jews for some time after Christ. Thus the Targum of Jonathan on Malach. i, 1 takes the word Mal'achi as a mere appellative and identifies

[1] It should be remembered, however that *'Abiah* must be translated "Yahweh is father," so that by analogy *Mal'achiah* should be rendered "Yahweh is messenger."

[2] W. R. SMITH, art. Malachi, in CHEYNE, Encyclop. Biblica, vol. iii, col. 2907

Digitized by Google

the unnamed prophet with *Esdras the Scribe*, and a statement to the same effect is found in the Talmud of Babylon: "Rabbi Y^e^hoshua' ben Korcha (first and second century after Christ) says Malachi is the same as Esdras."[1] St. Jerome not only bears testimony to the fact that the Jews of his time held the same view,[2] but even endorses it himself because of the meaning of the word *Mal'achi* in Hebrew, and because of the supposition that since the writer of Ecclesiasticus does not name Esdras among the worthies of Israel, he identifies him with one of the minor prophets he has enumerated.[3] Many early Church Fathers treated the name Malachias as an appellative, and in the course of time several Catholic interpreters have adopted the same view.[4]

It is true that some scholars[5] who regard the word *Mal'achi* as the personal name of a prophet claim that they thereby make secure the divine authority of the contents of his book. But besides the fact that, as granted by all, we know nothing of the actual life of that prophet, there is a very strong probability that the superscription was added by a later hand, and it is beyond doubt that the divine authority of a book of Holy Writ rests ultimately, not on any statement of that sacred writing, but on the infallible teaching of the living Church of Christ.[6]

In the absence of all distinct information concerning the personal life of the writer of the book of Malachias, only the general historical circumstances under which that prophetical writing was composed can be pointed out. Malachias

[1] *M^e^gillah* 15^a^.

[2] In Duodecim Prophetas Præfatio.

[3] Prolog. in Malachiam.

[4] Among those Catholic scholars may be mentioned RIBERA, S.J. (†1591), Dom CALMET, O.S.B. (†1757) etc. CORNELY, S.J., seems rather to be in favor of that same view.

[5] The argument was apparently advanced for the first time by the Protestant conservative KEIL. It has been repeated by LOWE, LESÊTRE, etc.

[6] Cfr. "General Introduction" by the present writer, chap. xxi.

Digitized by Google

falls in a part of the Persian period when the Persian authorities were well disposed towards the Jews. The condition of Judæa was unsatisfactory. The completion of the Temple had been effected, but the prosperity promised by Aggeus and Zacharias was not forthcoming. Hence people and priests became careless about Yahweh's worship, and willingly intermarried with their heathen or half-heathen neighbors. It was therefore to be feared lest the worship of the true God should be gradually brought down to the level of heathen religions, or confused with them. These and other similar dangers were averted by the strenuous efforts of Nehemias, and apparently also by the solemn promulgation of the Mosaic Law by Esdras.[1]

2. Contents of the Book of Malachias. The book of Malachias may be divided into six sections, "almost all of which relate to the dissatisfaction of the priests and people."[2] In the opening section (i, 2–5) the Jews complain that God has shown to them no particular marks of love, to which the prophet answers that their country was a cultivated land, whereas that of the Edomites is laid waste and is to be still further devastated. In the second section (i, 6–ii, 9) the priests are upbraided for constantly complaining of the multiplicity of their labors and the smallness of their income, while they themselves perverted the law and took forbidden sacrifices. In the third section (ii, 10–16) the prophet denounces the Jews who have divorced their own wives and contracted marriages with foreign women.[3] The fourth

[1] For details concerning the Persian period, see the present writer's "Outlines of Jewish History," chap. xxvi.

[2] Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 435 (Engl. Transl.).

[3] Instead of this generally received interpretation of the passage (ii, 10–16), W. R. SMITH (art. Malachi, in CHEYNE, Encyclop. Biblica, vol. iii, col. 2908 sq.) takes the section to mean, in a figurative sense, Israel's unfaithfulness to Yahweh by turning to foreign gods: *wedding* a foreign cult necessarily involved *divorce* from the covenant religion.

Digitized by Google

section (ii, 17–iii, 6) deals with the complaint of the Jews against the divine government of the world, announcing the sudden coming of Him whom they profess to seek, and who will purify the priests and the people with searching severity. The fifth section (iii, 7–12) declares that the complaints made at the time about the sterility of the ground are idle so long as the Jews withhold from Yahweh His tithes and offerings. In the sixth, and last, section the same subject is treated as in ii, 7–iii, 6. To the murmurers who say that God makes no distinction between the evil and the good, the prophet solemnly declares that the day is coming when Yahweh will own those that are His, and consume the wicked with the breath of a furnace, to the great joy of the righteous. "In view of a future at once so awful and so desirable, the Jews are called upon, by dutiful obedience to the Law which God has given them, and in expectation of the final precursor of 'the great and terrible day,' whom He promises them, to avert the threatened curse."[1]

The book of Malachias is quoted by Our Lord (Mt. xi, 10, 14; xvii, 10; Mk. ix, 10, etc.), by the angel Gabriel (Lk. i, 17), by St. Mark (i, 2), and by St. Paul (Rom. ix, 13).

3. Literary Style and Approximate Date of the Prophecy. The book of Malachias is eminently practical in its character, and minatory in its tone. The prophet does not aim at any rhetorical development of his message, but is intensely earnest about convincing his contemporaries that they should trust God's providence in the present government of the world, while preparing over against the terrors of the day of judgment. His language is direct, simple, and his style strictly dialectic. He generally starts with his thesis,[2] a principle or an accusation. Then he states the

[1] T. T. PEROWNE, Malachi, in the Cambridge Bible, p. 15. Cfr. TROCHON, Les Petits Prophètes, p. 516.

[2] Cfr. Malach. i, 2, 6, 7; ii, 13, 14, 17; iii, 7, 8, 13.

Digitized by Google

contradiction or objection which it is supposed to provoke. After this he reasserts and substantiates the position he had primitively taken.[1] Such a dialectic treatment by means of question and answer is far removed indeed from the oratorical development usual with the earlier prophets, but it was probably best suited for reaching the minds of the returned exiles, and may well be considered as a transition towards that method of exposition which ultimately prevailed in the Jewish schools. "Malachias has several peculiarities of expression, and his diction betrays marks of lateness, though not so numerous or pronounced as Esther, Chronicles, and Ecclesiastes." [2]

Besides this literary style, the contents of the book of Malachias make it clear at what general period it was written. The Exile is so long in the past that it is not even alluded to. The Temple is now fully rebuilt, and witnesses again the worship of Yahweh. Priests and people are blamed because of their defective manner of discharging or contributing to the sacrificial ritual. Juda is a Persian province, and the leading abuses of the time—the carelessness of the priesthood, intermarriage with foreign women, and neglect of the people in paying the sacred dues—are those which are mentioned in the Memoirs of Nehemias and Esdras. The prophecy belongs therefore to the post-exilic period, and more precisely to the times of Nehemias and Esdras.

It is impossible at the present day to determine exactly the date at which the book of Nehemias was composed. Many think that the prophecy was written after the solemn promulgation of the Priestly Code (444 B.C.).[3]

[1] Cfr. Jno. JAHN, loc. cit. p. 436.
[2] DRIVER, Introd. to Literat. of Old Test., p. 358.
[3] For a discussion of this difficult point, see W. R. SMITH, the Old Test. in the Jewish Church, p. 425 sqq., p. 446 (Second Edit.).

Digitized by Google

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTER XVIII.

THE REMAINING MINOR PROPHETS: JOEL, ABDIAS, JONAS.

I. THE PROPHET JOEL:

1. Name and Personal Life of the Prophet.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - First Part: Two Discourses on the Locust Invasion (i–ii, 17).
   - Second Part: Promises of Blessings (ii, 18–iii).
3. Date of his Prophecy:
   - Internal Criteria for determining it.
   - The Weight of Argument against an Early Date.

II. THE PROPHET ABDIAS:

1. Meaning of his Name. Obscurity about his Person.
2. Contents of his Writing:
   - General Topic (Oracle against Edom).
   - Probable Divisions.
3. Date of his Prophecy:
   - Principal Difficulties of Scholars concerning it.
   - Grounds for the more Probable Date

III. THE PROPHET JONAS:

1. Name and Personal Life of the Prophet.
2. Contents of his Book:
   - The Prophet's First Mission to Ninive (i–ii).
   - Jonas' Second Mission (iii–iv).
3. Historical Character and Probable Object of his Book.
4. Authorship and Date of the Prophecy:
   - Reasons for an Early Date (8th Cent. B.C.).
   - Arguments for a Post-Exilic Origin.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE REMAINING MINOR PROPHETS: JOEL, ABDIAS, JONAS.

§ 1. *The Prophet Joel.*

1. Name and Personal Life of the Prophet. The first among the Minor Prophets, whose work was not even provisionally ascribed to any date in the introductory chapter to the prophetical writings (chap. ix of the present volume), is the prophet Joel.[1] His name is generally taken to mean "Yahweh is God," as made up of the two divine names *Yahweh* and *'el.* St. Jerome, however, considering it as a causative imperfect of the verb *ya'al*, explains it as signifying *ἀρχομένος, incipiens.*[2] Other derivations have also been suggested, but it can hardly be doubted that the meaning "Yahweh is God" was the one "accepted by the later Hebrews, with whom the name was popular."[3]

Of the personal life of the prophet Joel next to nothing is known for certain. The only explicit statement regarding him in Holy Writ is to the effect that he was "the son of *Phatuel*" (Sept.: *βαθουήλ*; Heb.: *Pᵉtheu'el*).[4] From the few data supplied by his prophecy it is inferred with some probability that his home was in Juda. Thus he speaks repeatedly of *Sion* (ii, 1, 15; iii, 17); of the *children of*

[1] The prophet Joel is the second of the Minor Prophets in the Hebrew Text and the Vulgate, the fourth in the Septuagint Version.

[2] Cfr. MIGNE, Patr. Lat., vol. xxv, col. 947.

[3] G. G. CAMERON, art. Joel, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 672, footn. 1.

[4] Joel i, 1.

Digitized by Google

Sion (ii, 23); of *Juda and Jerusalem* (ii, 32; iii, 1, 17, 18, 20); the *children* of Juda (iii, 6, 8, 19); etc., and shows great familiarity with the Temple and its services (i, 9, 13, 14, 16, etc.). In fact, he is throughout concerned with Juda alone.[1] It has also been surmised that he belonged to the tribe of Levi, or to the priestly order, on account of the great value which he attaches to the forms of worship, complaining that the meat and drink offerings are cut off from the House of Yahweh, and that the priests, Yahweh's ministers, mourn, and urging the people to fasting, weeping, and humiliation, in order that Yahweh would be pleased to restore meat and drink offerings; etc. The legend recorded by the Pseudo-Epiphanius, and Dorotheus of Tyre, that Joel was born at Bethom (or Bethomeron) in the tribe of Ruben, is worth nothing. The Latin Church celebrates his feast on July 13th, and the Greek Church on October 18th.

2. Contents of the Book of Joel. The short book of Joel consists of two parts, in the first of which (i, 2–ii, 17) the prophet, and in the second (ii, 18–iii, 21) Yahweh, is the speaker. The first part is made up of two discourses which, however distinct, deal with the same topic, viz., the locust invasion. It opens with a graphic description of an unprecedented devastation of Juda by four species of locusts, which form, as it were, an immense army of God (cfr. ii, 25): the corn, the vintage, the fruit-trees were all destroyed by the swarming insects; the severest sufferings befell men and beasts, and every means to maintain the daily services of the Temple, and even life generally, was taken away. Such a public calamity should lead the people to national humiliation and repentance, all the more so because the present visitation is the harbinger of the approaching "Day of Yah-

[1] In Joel ii, 27, iii, 2, 6, Israel does not denote the Northern Kingdom, but Juda, God's chosen people *par excellence*.

Digitized by Google

weh." In his second discourse (chap. ii, 1–17) the prophet describes more fully, and in details true to nature, the terrible scourge which afflicts his country. The locusts are an army advancing with unbroken ranks and irresistible force. They darken the heavens, desolate the earth, and spread terror before them. They are the instruments of Yahweh's vengeance and form His overpowering army, and in consequence the people should turn to Him with all their heart, fasting, and supplicating His mercy and forgiveness.

The second part of the book (ii, 18–iii, 21) supposes that the prophet's calls to repentance have been heeded, and sets forth Yahweh's promises of blessings in answer to the humble prayers of priests and people. God promises, first of all, that there shall be an end of the locusts and that fertility shall be restored to the parched and wasted soil (ii, 18–27). To these promises of material prosperity He adds promises of spiritual blessings: the gift of prophecy shall be more extensively distributed, so that when the "Day of Yahweh" finally arrives, its terrors will not befall the faithful worshippers of God, but their heathen foes (ii, 28–32). Next comes the promise that Yahweh will bring back the captives of Juda and Jerusalem, and enter into judgment with all the peoples who had proved the enemies of the Jews. The Gentiles are invited to arm themselves and assemble in the valley of Josaphat (Josaphat = Yahweh judges), for battle with the God of Israel. The judgment takes place upon them, and salvation is granted to God's people (iii, 1–17). The book closes with the promise of a holy and prosperous future for Israel, while Egypt and Edom shall be desolate because of the wrongs inflicted by them upon the Jews (iii, 18–21).

3. Date of the Prophecy of Joel. In the absence of a distinct statement in the title of the book of Joel, and

Digitized by Google

of anything like the concordant testimony of Jewish or Christian writers[1] concerning the date at which that prophetic writing was composed, Biblical scholars naturally fall back upon the internal criteria for determining this difficult point. The following are the principal data supplied by the prophecy: (1) The writer mentions "Tyre and Sidon, and all the coast of the Philistines" (iii, 4), the Greeks, "the sons of Javan" (iii, 6), "the Sabeans" (iii, 8), "Egypt and Edom" (iii, 19), while he does not even allude to the Syrians, the Assyrians, and the Chaldæans, that is, to the peoples who figure so often in the prophets from the time of Jeroboam ii to that of Nehemias and Esdras; (2) the author knows apparently nothing of the Northern Kingdom, or at least he never speaks of it, even when he contemplates the restoration of the Jewish nation, or refers to the sale of the Israelites into slavery, for he always applies the word "Israel" (ii, 7; iii, 16), not to the ten tribes specifically, but to Juda generically;[2] (3) in the writer's time, the Jews (Yahweh's "inheritance") have become "a reproach among the nations"; they have been "scattered" by "all nations" who have "parted" Yahweh's

[1] The principal dates to which the composition of the book of Joel has been ascribed are as follows:

About 950 B.C.: BÜNSEN; KARLE.
Time of Josaphat: I. F. BAUER.
Reign of Joram: KIMEHI, and others.
Reign of Joas: CREDNER, MOVERS; HITZIG; WINER; EWALD; DELITZSCH; KEIL; AUBERLEN, WÜNSCHE; E. SCHRADER; VIGOUROUX; ORELLI; TROCHON; KAULEN, etc.
Reign of Ozias: ABRABANEL; VITRINGA; ROSENMÜLLER, EICHHORN, DE WETTE; HENGSTENBERG; BLEEK; KNOBEL; etc.
Time of Ezechias: BERTHOLDT; STEUDEL.
Reign of Manasses: RASHI, and other Jewish writers; DRUSIUS; NEWCOME; JAHN.
Reign of Josias: TARROVIUS; ECKERMANN, Dom CALMET.
Toward the End of the Monarchy: SCHRŒDER.
After the Exile: VATKE; HILGENFELD; OORT; KUENEN; DUHM; A.B. DAVIDSON; MERX; DRIVER; BENNETT; OTTLEY; KAUTZSCH; etc.
Date Unknown: Bp. HANNEBERG.

[2] In Joel iii. 2 the expression "My inheritance Israel" is somewhat ambiguous. Even here, however, it probably designates, not Northern Israel, but Juda who is to be gathered into the valley of Josaphat.

Digitized by Google

"land"; but "the captivity of Juda and Jerusalem will be brought back" by Yahweh (iii, 1–3); (4) the Tyrians, Sidonians, and Philistines, we are told, have plundered Yahweh's treasures and carried them into the temples of their gods, but more particularly have sold captive men of Juda to the Greeks (iii, 4–6); (5) the writer denounces desolation against Egypt and Edom for having put to death innocent men of Juda in their land (iii, 19); (6) there is in the prophecy no denunciation of great national crimes, and there is no mention of idolatry; in fact, the Jews of the time are apparently faithful to the Temple services as far as the public calamities of the time allow (i, 9, 13; ii, 14); (7) there is likewise no reference to the Jewish kings or princes, whereas the elders (i, 14), and especially the priests (i, 9, 13; ii, 17), appear very prominently; (8) "the valley of Josaphat," twice mentioned in the book (iii, 2, 12), had presumably been thus called from the king of that name; (9) the close resemblances between Joel and Amos seem to show that one of the prophets is not independent of the other (cfr. Joel iii, 6 with Amos i, 2; Joel iii, 18 with Amos ix, 13[b]).

Such are the internal data usually appealed to in order to ascribe the prophecy of Joel either to an early date—commonly the reign of Josias, about the middle of the ninth century B.C.,—or to a late date—long after the Babylonian exile. Of these notes of time, however, several can hardly be regarded as conclusive *for* or *against* either of these two positions. Thus the absence of allusions to the Syrians, Assyrians, or Chaldæans is no doubt significant, inasmuch as these nations figure prominently in history and prophecy from the time of Achaz to that of Nehemias. But the silence may be accounted for equally well by placing the composition of the book of Joel either before the time of Achaz or after the prophet Zacharias. The mention of

Digitized by Google

Egypt and Edom may indeed be connected with Sesak's invasion in the reign of Roboam (cfr. III Kings xiv, 25 sqq.), and the revolt of Edom under Joram, the grandfather of Joas (cfr. IV Kings viii, 20–22). But these events were remote in Joas' time; and besides, Edom is constantly mentioned in post-exilic literature, while the allusions to Egypt in Joel's prophecy may be simply literary reminiscences of the ancient prophetic condemnations against the Pharaos, or may even refer to the time of the Ptolemies, in the third century B.C. Again, the silence of the book of Joel relative to the Jewish kings and princes, together with its honorable mention of elders and priests, may be understood of the minority of Joas when the high priest Joiada was all-powerful in Juda; but it agrees, if anything, better with the time after the Exile, when there was no king in Israel, and when the high priest was the chief Jewish authority. In like manner, the style and diction of Joel exhibit a goodly number of parallels with those chiefly of the prophetical literature. But this may be interpreted in two different ways. Either the book of Joel is a very early and popular book constantly used by subsequent Jewish writers, or it is a very late composition largely depending on pre-existing Hebrew literature. Both suppositions have been strongly maintained by prominent scholars, though, as it seems, the latter is more probable. The easy and usually classical style of the prophet is, all things considered, best accounted for by regarding him as an accomplished student of earlier literary works.[1]

The foregoing remarks show that even among those notes of time which, strictly speaking, are conclusive neither *for* nor *against* an early date for the prophecy of Joel, some there are which can easily, and even more naturally, be under-

[1] For details, cfr. DRIVER, Joel, in the Cambridge Bible, pp. 19–25, and authors there referred to.

Digitized by Google

stood as pointing to a late date. Now that this latter interpretation of such data is the correct one can hardly be denied in view of the following notes of time which clearly make for the post-exilic period as the time at which the book of Joel was composed. In Joel iii, 6 the mention of the Greeks points distinctly to a post-exilic date, and the same thing must be said with reference to the description in iii, 2 of God's inheritance as "scattered among the nations," of the Holy "Land" as parted by "all nations"; for these expressions are altogether too strong to be referred fairly to any calamity less than Juda's exile into Babylon. The silence of Joel as to idolatry in Juda, and his anxiety for the regular maintenance of the Temple services, because their discontinuance is equivalent to a break in the union between Yahweh and His people, are so unlike the way in which all other prophets down to Jeremias speak of the religious condition of the people, and very particularly of the efficacy of the sacrificial service, that the post-exilic period is clearly before the writer's mind. In Joel, again, "Juda and the people of Yahweh are convertible terms; northern Israel does not appear; even the promises are limited to Juda and Jerusalem (iii, 1, 18, 20). This is not the case in the earlier prophets: the prophets of Israel do not exclude Juda at least from their promises, nor do the prophets of Juda exclude Israel."[1] It must therefore be admitted that in Joel the term "Israel" is used in the post-exilic sense of Juda as representing the chosen people.

While the view that the book of Joel is post-exilic is gaining ground among scholars, the precise part of that period to which it should be assigned remains unknown, in the absence of distinct historical allusions. Driver[2] thinks that "it may be placed most safely shortly after Aggeus

[1] DRIVER, loc. cit. p. 18. [2] Loc. cit., p. 25.

Digitized by Google

and Zachar. i–viii (about 500 B.C.)," while at the same time he admits "the possibility that it *may* be later, and that it dates in reality from the century after Malachias." On the whole, a date subsequent to the prophecy of Malachias (chaps. i–viii) seems more probable. Ottley[1] and others refer the composition of the book of Joel to about 350 B.C.

§ 2. *The Prophet Abdias.*

1. Meaning of his Name. Obscurity about his Person. The shortest of the prophetical writings of the Old Testament (it has only twenty-one verses) is ascribed to Abdias by its title.[2] The name Abdias is the Greek form of the word *'obhadyah*, which is not uncommon in the Hebrew Bible, and the meaning of which is the "servant (or worshipper) of Yahweh." It is usually treated as a proper name, although reasons have been given by scholars for considering it as a mere appellative. Like the name of Zacharias, that of Abdias may not be the personal name of a Jewish prophet. Again, in Holy Writ a true prophet is often designated under the appellative name of "the servant of Yahweh." And in particular, the fact that nothing is known of the person of Abdias, while the short work ascribed to him is apparently made up of parts of different origin, renders it probable that the name Abdias is only an appellative prefixed to the book in order not to leave it without a title.

In the absence of authoritative information concerning the writer of the book ascribed to Abdias, conflicting Jewish and Christian traditions have been freely started and circulated regarding the tribe to which he belonged and the

[1] The Hebrew Prophets, p. 95. Cfr. E. KAUTZSCH, the Literature of the Old Test., pp. 134, 199.

[2] The book of Abdias stands fourth among the Minor Prophets, both in the Hebrew Text and in the Vulgate Version, between the prophecies of Amos and Jonas.

Digitized by Google

supposed circumstances of his life. Thus while some traditions affirm that he was of the tribe of Ephraim, and of Bethachamar or Bethacharam in the territory of Sichem, others make of him an Edomite who embraced Judaism, "the hatchet," according to the Jewish proverb, "returning into the wood out of which it was itself taken." Other traditions identify him with the steward of Achab's palace,[1] who hid the prophets persecuted by Jezabel, to which later guesses add that he was the prophet or third captain of fifty, who was spared by Elias,[2] and that the prophet's widow for whom Eliseus wrought a miracle[3] was his widow. In St. Jerome's time the grave of Abdias was pointed out in Samaria, along with those of Elias and St. John the Baptist, and the Latin Church celebrates his feast on the 19th of November. In reality "nothing is known of Abdias: the race to which he belonged, his station in life, his place of birth, and his manner of death, are equally unknown to us."[4]

2. Contents of the Book of Abdias. The twenty-one verses of which the prophecy of Abdias is made up are almost exclusively concerned with the fate of Edom, as is announced in the opening words: "Thus saith Adonai Yahweh concerning Edom." Yahweh has summoned the nations against her, and despite her trust in her rocky fastnesses she will be completely destroyed, not simply spoiled as by ordinary thieves (verses 1–6). Her own allies have turned against her (verse 7), and her folly appears in that she exposed herself to such treachery (verses 8, 9). This terrible judgment upon Edom is a just retribution of unbrotherly conduct towards Israel. When strangers sacked Jerusalem

[1] Cfr. III Kings xviii, 3 sqq.
[2] Cfr. IV Kings i. 13.
[3] Cfr. IV Kings iv. 1.
[4] Abbé TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 193.

Digitized by Google

and cast lots over it (verses 10, 11), Edom joined them in triumphing over the children of Juda, and in deceiving and capturing unfortunate fugitives (12–14). So now

> As thou hast done, it is done to thee;
> Thy deed returns on thy own head (15 b c).

The day of Yahweh is near upon "all the nations," in whose destruction Edom shall share under the combined efforts of "the house of Jacob" and "the house of Joseph" (16–18). The borders of Israel will be enlarged in every direction. "Saviors" shall appear on Mount Sion to "judge" the Mount of Esau, and the kingdom shall be Yahweh's (19–21).

Although the contents of the book of Abdias are short and connected with one and the same topic, the fate of Edom, yet they are variously divided by various critics. They are usually divided into three parts (1–9; 10–16; 17–21) by scholars who look upon the book as a literary unit,[1] while they are commonly broken into two (i, 1–14; 15–21) or three (1–9; 10–14; 15–21) sections by those who think that the prophetical writing is made up of oracles which belong to different periods in Jewish history.[2]

3. Date of the Prophecy of Abdias. As just alluded to, the date to which the composition of the book of Abdias should be ascribed is a matter of controversy. Even Biblical scholars who agree in regarding its component parts as coming from the pen of only one author differ considerably as to the date at which the book was written. Thus while Keil,

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1086; TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes; E. PHILIPPE, art. Abdias, in VIGOUROUX, Dictionnaire de la Bible, col. 20; after the manner of K. F. KEIL, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. i, p. 390 (Engl. Transl.); etc.

[2] Cfr. HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, art. Obadiah, vol. iii p. 578. CHEYNE-BLACK, Encyclop. Biblica, art. Obadiah, vol. iii, col. 3456 sqq.; BENNETT and ADENEY, a Biblical Introduction, p. 243; etc.

Digitized by Google

Orelli, Vigouroux, Trochon, Lesêtre, etc., assign its composition to about the reign of Joram (9th cent. B.C.), Meyrick, Jahn, Ackermann, Allioli, etc.,[1] refer it to about the time of the Babylonian Captivity, some three centuries after King Joram. The following reason is sometimes given to account for such widely divergent views among critics who are usually at one in ascribing most of the prophetical writings to an early date. "The shortness of Abdias' prophecy, which not only is devoid of a title, but also is without sufficiently distinct allusions [to historical facts], accounts for so great a divergence of opinions among scholars."[2] Of course, there is a great deal of truth in this general statement. As it is worded, however, it is somewhat misleading. There is a title to the book of Abdias,[3] although that title does not contain the more or less traditional data usually embodied in the titles to similar books of the Old Testament. Again, the allusions in the prophecy of Abdias to the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldæans,[4] appear so distinct that they are readily understood of this great historical event by scholars who are not anxious to assign an early date to that sacred writing.[5] The book is indeed quite short, but this shortness can hardly be regarded as an insuperable obstacle to reaching the probable date of its composition, so long as its contents allude to a definite period in Jewish history.

In reality the difficulties experienced by contemporary scholars to determine the date at which the book of Abdias was written do not arise chiefly from the shortness of that

[1] Cfr. CORNELY, Introductio, vol. ii. part ii, p. 556.

[2] VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique, vol. ii, no. 1085.

[3] Abdias, verse 1[a]. Cfr. Abbé TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 205; KNABENBAUER, S.J., In Prophetas Minores, p. 345: etc.

[4] Abdias verses 10–14.

[5] Cfr. Bp. HANNEBERG, Histoire de la Révélation Biblique, vol. i. p. 366; DRIVER, Introduction to the Literat. of the Old Test., p. 319: T. T. PEROWNE, Obadiah, in the Cambridge Bible, p. 9 sq.: etc.

Digitized by Google

prophecy. They are due principally to the various elements which leading critics think go to make up this short book, and concerning the origin of which they are at variance. The first of these difficulties is suggested by the fact that the first nine verses of the prophecy of Abdias are manifestly, and indeed most intimately, connected with Jeremias xlix, 7–22. The resemblances in thought and expression are closest between Abd., verse 1–4 and Jerem. xlix, 14–16; Abd., verse 5 and Jerem. xlix, 9; while they are unmistakable, though not so close, between Abd., verses 6, 8, 9[a] and Jerem. xlix, 10, 7, 22[b]; respectively.[1] Hence the difficulty to decide whether Jeremias borrowed from Abdias, or Abdias from Jeremias, or both from a common source, and it is plain that the date to be admitted for the origin of Abdias, 1–9 must needs vary according as one or another of these suppositions is adopted. A second difficulty in the way of fixing the date of composition of the book of Abdias arises from the fact that verses 1–9 and 15–21 refer to quite different situations, for these latter verses have to do with a divine judgment upon "all nations," a topic plainly foreign to the one dealt with in the opening verses 1–9, and usually regarded as belonging to a period much later in date than the situation described in verses 1–9. In the third place, it is not easy to define whether verses 10–14 should be connected with 1–9 or with 15–21,[2] and this difficulty has a bearing on the manner in which the book originated, and consequently on the time also of its composition.

Despite these and other such difficulties, the date which recent scholars in increasing number regard as more probable for the completion of the book of Abdias is the period after the Babylonian Exile. The following cumulative argument

[1] Cfr. art. Obadiah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. iii, p. 578.

[2] Cfr. W. H. BENNETT, a Biblical Introduction, p. 243; HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. iii, p. 579.

Digitized by Google

tells powerfully in favor of this position. In the first place, whoever bears in mind the fact that the Deuteronomic Law which was reformulated under Josias[1] contains this stringent command: "Thou shalt not abhor the Edomite, because he is thy brother,"[2] will readily admit that the first nine verses of Abdias, which give vent to most hostile feelings against Edom, were written subsequently to the seventh century B.C., and that only a henious national crime on the part of the Edomites can account for that deep resentment of Israel against them which appears throughout the book of Abdias. In the next place, this heinous national crime, as far as can be gathered from Biblical data, is no other than Edom's unworthy conduct on the occasion of Jerusalem's destruction by the Babylonians in 586 B.C. "When Jerusalem was destroyed by Nabuchodonosor," as well said by a most conservative scholar, Professor Sayce,[3] "the Edomites took part with the enemy, and rejoiced over the calamities of Juda,—conduct which aroused bitter feelings against them on the part of the Jews." That such is, in point of fact, the occasion of Israel's hatred towards Edom is particularly inferred from Ezechiel xxxv, 3–15, and Abdias, verses 10–14. In Ezechiel the complete ruin of Edom is announced in connection with the destruction of the Holy City by the Chaldæans, and the thoughts expressed in Abdias, verses 10–14, are parallel to those of Ezechiel. Indeed, independently of this close resemblance in ideas between Ezechiel and Abdias, verses 10–14, the terms of the latter passage can be adequately understood only of the capture and destruction of Jerusalem by Nabuchodonosor:[4] only that event could be spoken of as "the day when strangers

[1] For information regarding this point see the present writer's "Special Introduction to the Old Test.," part i, pp. 117–126.

[2] Deuteronomy xxiii, 7.

[3] In HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. i, p. 645.

[4] For an able discussion of this point, see T. T. PEROWNE, loc. cit., pp. 9–11.

Digitized by Google

carried away his [Juda's] army captive, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, . . . "[1] as "the day of his [Juda's] leaving his country, . . . the day of their [the children of Juda's] destruction,"[2] "the day of their ruin,"[3] etc.

The last stage in the cumulative argument brings the date of composition of the book of Abdias long (how long cannot be defined) after the Return from the Babylonian Exile. This can be inferred from Abdias, 15–21, the apocalyptic tone of which is recognized by unbiassed scholars, and is indeed made manifest by Abdias' reference to "the Day of Yahweh as being at hand upon all nations," to a restoration of all Israel, to the wonderful extent of territory and position of command which await the Jews in Yahweh's kingdom. These apocalyptic features so connect the prophecy of Abdias with that of Joel, with the book of Daniel, and with the second part of Zacharias (ix–xiv), that it is only natural to think that they all belong likewise to the post-exilic period, and indeed to a comparatively late date after the Return from Babylon.[4]

§ 3. *The Prophet Jonas.*

1. Name and Personal Life of the Prophet. The last work included among the Minor Prophets of which we

[1] Abdias, verse 11.

[2] Abdias, verse 12.

[3] Abdias, verse 13.—The principal objection usually made against this interpretation of Abdias, 10–14, is drawn from the silence of that prophet concerning the ruin of Yahweh's Temple. It is urged that had the sacred writer had in view the ruin of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. he would certainly have described the destruction of Yahweh's House as mocked at by the Edomites. But this objection does not stand when it is remembered that Abdias, 10–14, is parallel to Ezechiel xxxv, 3–15, wherein the ruin of the Temple is not alluded to.

[4] For detailed information concerning the date of composition of the book of Abdias, see more particularly the articles on Obadiah in HASTINGS, CHEYNE, and other Dictionaries of the Bible.

Digitized by Google

have to treat receives its name from "Jonas the son of Amathi" (Jonas i, 1), plainly the same as the prophet Jonas who in the fourth book of Kings (xiv, 25) is also called "the son of Amathi" (Heb. *'Amittai*). The name Jonas is usually derived from the Hebrew *Yonah*, and therefore taken to mean "a dove"; it is not improbable, however, that because of the complaining words of the prophet in the small book ascribed to him (cfr. Jonas iv), the name Jonas should be directly connected,—as was done centuries ago by St. Jerome (Comm. on Jonas iv, 1),—with the very root *Yanah* ("to mourn") of the Hebrew *Yonah*, and therefore be understood as meaning *dolens*, "complaining."

Of the personal life of Jonas little indeed is known for certain. In the fourth book of Kings (xiv, 25) he is only incidentally referred to as a prophet who was born in Gath-Ḥepher,—a town in the Northern tribe of Zabulon (Josue xix, 10, 13),—and who foretold aright an event of Jeroboam's reign (9th cent. B.C.), viz., the recovery by Israel of a part of its possessions. Nor is anything like positive information concerning the various circumstances of Jonas' life and death to be gathered from the short book which bears his name. The four chapters which make up that sacred writing deal exclusively with his brief mission to Ninive, and do not even mention his return from that great city. It is not, therefore, surprising to find that, in the absence of data relative to the prophet's personal life, many, and at times conflicting, traditions have been started and freely circulated concerning Jonas. "The Jewish doctors, with their usual puerility, have supposed him to be the son of the widow of Sarepta: 'Now by this I know,' said she to Elias, 'that thou art a man of God, and that the word of the Lord in thy mouth is truth': אמת (III Kings xvii, 24). The restored child was thenceforward named בן־אמתי, a title which was to

Digitized by Google

preserve the memory of his miraculous resurrection."[1] And yet this childish play upon the Hebrew words *'Emeth* and *'Amittai*, was seriously repeated by the Pseudo-Epiphanius and by Dorotheus. It has also been supposed that Jonas was the son of the widow of Sunam, whom Eliseus called to life and restored to his mother,[2] and even that he was the son of Abdias. Others again have fancied that Jonas was the young man whom Eliseus entrusted with the mission of anointing Jehu, king over Israel.[3] Traditions are likewise unreliable as regards the prophet's place of burial. While the Pseudo-Epiphanius thinks that Jonas was buried near Tyre, St. Jerome affirms that his grave was pointed out in Gath-Ḥepher. During the Middle Ages divers places were connected with the burial of Jonas. At the present day Jonas' tomb is indeed shown near the site of ancient Ninive, but prominent archæologists look for it in other places.[4]

2. Contents of the Book of Jonas. Although the contents of the book of Jonas are sometimes divided into three parts (chaps. i–ii; iii; iv),[5] they naturally fall under two heads, viz., the prophet's first mission to Ninive (i–ii), and his second mission to the same city (iii–iv),[6] for the beginning of each section is distinctly marked by the opening formula, "And the word of Yahweh came to Jonas" (i, 1), "And the word of Yahweh came to Jonas the second time" (iii, 1).

In the account of Jonas' first mission to Ninive we are told of his attempt to flee to Tarsis from the presence of

[1] Jno. EADIE art. Jonah, in KITTO's Cyclop. of Biblical Literature.
[2] Cfr. IV Kings iv. 32 sqq.
[3] Cfr. IV Kings ix. 1 sqq.
[4] For details see TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes. p. 216 sq.
[5] Cfr. VIGOUROUX Manuel Biblique vol. ii. no. 1089; etc.
[6] Cfr. Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 268; R. CORNELY, S.J. Introductio vol. ii, part ii, p. 557. etc.

Digitized by Google

Yahweh, that he might escape the task assigned to him, the manner in which he was overtaken, and his wonderful deliverance from the great fish which had swallowed him together with a hymn of thanksgiving which is ascribed to him while still in the fish's belly.

The account of the prophet's second mission is hardly less marvellous. In conformity with Yahweh's order, Jonas goes to Ninive, enters a day's journey into it, and foretells its destruction in forty days. Immediately a general repentance takes place, and God spares Ninive. Whereupon Jonas becomes exceedingly angry and wishes for death. He expostulates with Yahweh and says that it was in anticipation of this very result that he had wished to flee to Tarsis. He nevertheless takes his station on a mountain to the east of Ninive, and, under a booth he has erected, waits to see what is to become of the city. God prepares a gourd which affords to Jonas a most pleasant shade. When, however, at the divine command, this gourd is struck by a worm and withers, the prophet, exposed to the burning heat of the sun, murmurs again and wishes to die. Then it is that Yahweh rebukes him for being so much grieved over the withering of a gourd, and yet wishing that God should not be touched by the repentance of a city in which were found more than 120,000 children who had not yet reached the age of discretion, and also much cattle.

3. Historical Character and Probable Object of the Book. Among the vexed questions which are connected with the book of Jonas, that of its historical character stands out prominently. The contents are written in prose,—except, of course, the hymn ascribed to Jonas in ii, 2-11,—and the book reads much more like a historical than a prophetical composition.[1] As it seems to narrate

[1] Cfr. VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique. vol. ii no. 1088.

Digitized by Google

actual events, so its historical character has been generally assumed by Jewish and Christian writers down to recent times. The following are the principal grounds in favor of this traditional view: (1) The admission of the book into the Hebrew canon, and especially its position in the series of the prophetical writings, makes it very probable that the narrative consists of fact. Had the collectors of the canonical books thought that it exhibited religious truths in the garb of allegory or parable, they would have put it among the Hagiographa.[1] (2) Many historical and geographical statements in the book of Jonas prove its credibility and genuine historical character. The hero is designated by his own name and by that of his father. "His mission to the Ninivites is in perfect keeping with the historical relations of Jonas' time, in which the first cases occurred of contact between Israel and Assyria (Osee v, 13; x, 6). . . . The description of the greatness of Ninive (Jonas iii, 3) is in harmony with the statements of the classical writers (Diodorus Siculus, ii, 3; Strabo, book xvi, chap. i, § 3). Its deep moral corruption is testified by Nahum iii, 1; Sophonias ii, 13 sqq.; and the mourning of men and beasts (Jonas iii, 5, 8) is confirmed as an Asiatic custom by Herodotus, book ix, § 24, being in itself supported by analogous customs of our own in funeral processions."[2] (3) The character and person of Jonas are natural. All that he does and says is suitable to his times and the circumstances in which he was placed. His severe preaching against the Ninivites, his Judaic views of the divine mercy being limited to his own countrymen, his zeal for the honor of Yahweh, his resistance to the divine will in certain circumstances, his murmuring, the mixed virtues and vices of his disposition, present

[1] Cfr. KEIL, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. i, p. 397 sq. (Engl. Transl.); Abbé V ERMONI, art. Jonas, in VIGOUROUX Diction. de la Bible, col. 1608.
[2] KEIL, ibid. Cfr. also ERMONI loc. cit., col. 1609.

Digitized by Google

a picture drawn from nature.[1] (4) Jewish tradition as reflected in Tobias xiv, 4 (in the Greek translation of the book); in III Machab. vi, 8; in Josephus, Antiq. of the Jews, book ix, chap. x, § 2; in the Targum on Nahum i, 1; in the Talmud, and as repeated by the Fathers and subsequent writers of the Christian Church, has always considered the contents of the book of Jonas as literal history. (5) Above all, "the distinct authority of Christ attests the truth of Jonas' history. He affirms that Jonas was three days and three nights in the fish's belly and that the Ninivites repented at his preaching. He declares Himself greater than Jonas. Surely He would not have compared Himself with a man in a fable, a parable, or a myth. As well might we extinguish the historical existence of the queen of Saba mentioned immediately afterwards by Our Lord, and consider the account of her visit to Solomon an allegory or fiction (Matt. xii, 39–41; Luke xi, 29–32)."[2] This will appear all the more cogent because the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus were asking for an actual miracle as a sign of His divine mission, when He told them that no other sign would be given than "that of Jonas the prophet" (Luke xi, 29); that is, as explained in Matt. xi, 40, a miracle like the one which is narrated in the book of Jonas (Jonas staying three days and three nights in the fish's belly) and which was then universally regarded as an actual event. Whence it is inferred that Our Lord treated the narrative in the book of Jonas as strictly historical.

Such are the chief arguments which are usually brought forth to establish the historical character of the prophecy of Jonas,[3] and which to many minds still appear conclusive

[1] Cfr. HAVERNICK, Einleitung, ii, 2, § 246: Samuel DAVIDSON, Introduct., vol. iii, p. 271; Abbé TROCHON les Petits Prophètes, p. 223, etc.

[2] Samuel DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 270.

[3] They will be found best exposed in TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes; KEIL,

Digitized by Google

that the contents of the book are those of a literal, matter-of-fact history, not those of an allegorical and pictorial composition. A large number, however, of recent scholars who have examined closely these various arguments consider them as an insufficient evidence in favor of the historical character of the book of Jonas.

They refuse, and indeed rightly, to attach much importance to the first of those arguments. The historical or non-historical character of an inspired writing cannot seriously be regarded as the test whereby the collectors of the canonical books determined the sacredness or non-sacredness of a writing. They most likely reckoned the book of Jonas among the Holy Scriptures chiefly because it was ascribed to the prophet of that name; and they no doubt included it in the second division of the Hebrew Text, viz., "the Prophets," because it had been composed before that second collection of sacred writings was brought to a close, whereas the prophecy of Daniel, despite its obvious historical and prophetical features, was placed among "the Writings," apparently because the second canon, "the Prophets," had already been closed.

The same scholars look upon the second argument in favor of the historical character of the prophecy of Jonas as hardly less inconclusive than the first. "It is impossible," says one of them, "to derive the historical truth of what the book states from these particulars (that is, from certain points of history and geography correctly referred to in the book). They do *not* prove it. All that they show is the conformity of various points with the known facts of history. It is quite possible, for aught belonging to the geographical or historical notices in question, that the story of Jonas going

Introduction; KAULEN, Einleitung in die heilige Schrift, 3d edit., p. 351 sqq.; etc.

Digitized by Google

to Ninive and travelling through it for three days partakes largely of the fictitious. The legendary and parabolical may be conformed to verisimilitude. A careful writer will assuredly refrain from violating the probable, or running counter to facts, manners, and customs, as far as they come in his way. To make a story agree with history and geography whenever it touches on their respective regions is one thing; to convert it into true history is another."[1] "Formerly," says a more recent scholar, Fr. Lagrange, O.P., "it was deemed strange that God should inspire an edifying story devoid of historical reality. . . . And yet it is a matter of experience that an invented story may be more useful than a *true* story. . . . Such books [that is to say, unhistorical writings] assume a rigorous historical precision without the least intention of deceiving any one. In order, therefore, to prove the historical character of a book of the Bible, it is not sufficient to insist on the vividness of the narration, the multiplicity of the details, the allusions to history or geography therein contained."[2]

Remarks of the same import are urged against the conclusiveness of the third argument set forth above. If every trait in the delineation of the character and person of Jonas was lifelike and true to nature, as is maintained in the argument, this would prove at most that the book *may be* historical, not that it *is* so, for lifelike portraits may be drawn by the imagination of an able writer, aided perhaps by an original which he uses as his starting-point. Moreover, certain details in the sketching of Jonas' portrait, such, for instance, as his impertinent discussion with Jahweh in iv, 9, can hardly be considered as true to life.

As regards the fourth argument drawn from the Jewish

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introduct. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 269.

[2] Fr. LAGRANGE, O.P., in "Revue Biblique Internationale," Oct. 1896, pp. 508, 511.

Digitized by Google

tradition, no scholar worthy the name considers this source of information as infallible in matters of historical or literary criticism; and the same thing is unquestionably true with even the universal consent of the Fathers and subsequent writers of the Christian Church in such scientific matters. Besides, the passage of Tobias (xiv, 4) appealed to as recording the old Jewish tradition is not found in the Latin Vulgate, and may not be genuine. The next witness to that tradition is an apocryphal writing, viz., the third book of the Machabees, the historical value of which is far from beyond suspicion. Josephus does indeed set forth the contents of the book of Jonas, in his Antiquities of the Jews, but the manner in which he introduces and closes his exposition of those contents leads one to surmise that he did not fully rely on them. Lastly, it is certain that during the Middle Ages the Jewish rabbi Abrabanel looked upon the book of Jonas as the narrative of a dream, while Kimchi, a more celebrated Jewish scholar still, assigned to it a moral scope. Plainly, then, Jewish tradition should not be considered as a conclusive argument in favor of the historical character of the book of Jonas, even though it should have been repeated century after century by the Christian Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers.

In answer to the last and chief argument adduced by the defenders of the traditional view, viz., the authority of Our Lord, the opponents of the historical character of the book of Jonas contend that this authority is wrongly appealed to. "They maintain that Our Saviour conformed to the usual manner of speaking and to the traditions of the Jews of His time, and did not go against them when it was not necessary to do so."[1] "It was no part of His mission on earth to teach

[1] Card. MEIGNAN les Prophètes d'Israel (Paris, 1892), p. 369. Cfr. Ed. KÖNIG, art. Jonah in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, vol. ii, p. 751; etc.

Digitized by Google

criticism or to correct all the erroneous opinions held by the Jews respecting their own Scriptures. He reasoned with them on grounds they acknowledged, employing the *argumentum ad hominem*, and adopting current views whenever they suited the purpose of that higher mission which He came to promote. Where He does not assert a thing on His own independent authority, but merely to confound or confute the Jews of His day, He should not be quoted as a voucher for the historical truth of facts or events."[1] Nor should any special stress, we are told, be laid on the comparison between Jonas remaining three days and three nights in the fish's belly and Our Lord spending the same length of time in the grave, which is explicitly set forth in Matt. xii, 40. For a careful examination of the four passages (Matt. xii, 38–42; xvi, 1–4; Mark viii, 11–13; Luke xi, 16, 29–32) wherein mention is made of some wonderful "sign" as asked of Jesus by His contemporaries, renders it very probable that this allusion to Our Lord's resurrection as it is distinctly pointed out in Matt. xii, 40 (or even as it is less clearly stated in Luke xi, 30) was no part of His original saying.[2] Whence it would appear that Christ's authority should not be appealed to as actually affirming the fact of Jonas' deliverance from the sea-monster's belly. "It is true that, as the repentance of the Ninivites is accepted as historical, the incident of the whale would probably have been treated in the same manner; but in neither case was the absence or the presence of historical foundation essential to the application of the narrative as a 'sign.' Our Lord's use of it starts from the way in which it was understood by His hearers: behind this He does not go."[3] For

[1] Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd. to the Old Test., vol. iii, p. 270.

[2] The ablest discussion of this point of literary criticism appeared in "the Biblical World" (Aug. 1902), pp. 99–112, in an article entitled "What was the sign of Jonah?" and written by Prof. B. W. BACON.

[3] W. SANDAY, Inspiration, p. 433.

Digitized by Google

these and similar reasons even thorough believers in revelation and in the divine authority of Christ think that Our Lord's reference to Jonas in the evangelical records does not preclude a scientific discussion or even an actual rejection of the historical character of the prophecy which bears his name. The Abbé Trochon, for instance, writes that "Catholic orthodoxy does not forbid us to maintain that the book of Jonas does not relate history, but is simply a parable,"[1] and quotes the following words from the reports of "the Conférences ecclésiastiques de Versailles" for 1879: "Thus far, the Church has not settled the question [of the historical character of the book of Jonas], and probably she will never settle it. Nor has she excluded from the ranks of her children Catholic interpreters, such as Richard Simon and Jno. Jahn, who have denied the historicity of Jonas."[2]

Scholars who thus think that the arguments in favor of the historical character of the book of Jonas do not bear out that position, and that Our Lord's authority, in particular, should not be appealed to in its defence, feel quite at liberty to reject the traditional view. Their chief reasons to regard the narrative as not strictly historical may be briefly given as follows: (1) It was not the aim of the author to write history. The work begins abruptly, and the events connected with the twofold mission of Jonas to Ninive are given only in so far as they contribute to set forth the prophetic lessons of the book. A matter-of-fact history would have naturally stated into what place the prophet was vomited forth by the sea-monster; what were the sins of the Ninivites, a point which the prophetical histories are by no means accustomed in other cases to pass over; by what particular calamity the city was to be destroyed; whether the abolition of idolatry was entailed by the general repentance of the inhabitants;

[1] Abbé TROCHON. les Petits Prophètes p. 221.
[2] Abbé TROCHON. loc. cit. p. 221, footn. 2.

Digitized by Google

what was the name of the Assyrian king in whose time all this took place, who also turned to the true God with such humility and repentance; etc. Instead of these historical data, only two scenes are detailed: the one on the sea, the other at Ninive. The transitions in the story look like the rapid flight of the imagination, not the steady flow of historical narrative, and the book closes abruptly after giving the lessons intended.[1] (2) The various characters delineated in the book of Jonas can hardly be considered as true to life. The character of the prophet himself appears indeed very strange: to fly from God's presence, he selects a ship which will take him to the farthest West (Tarsis, in Spain), his mission being to the far East (Ninive, in Assyria);[2] when in imminent danger of destruction by a tempest, and when all around him are putting up prayers, he is quietly sleeping; he voluntarily offers himself to be thrown into the sea; and, lastly, he is constantly opposing God, speaking to Him, at least once, in a disrespectful manner (cfr. Jonas iv, 9). The conduct of the sailors seems also not to be fully true to life. It is strange that they should cease calling upon their respective gods, to cry to "Yahweh" (Jonas i, 5, 14), and that having found out the culprit, who indeed has pleaded guilty, and has urged them to throw him into the sea as a sure means of calming it, they should not resort at once to that means, and should even call Jonas "innocent" (Jonas i, 14). Again, the character of the king of Ninive is not drawn in harmony with what is known of the haughtiness and cruelty of Eastern monarchs generally, and of Assyrian rulers in particular: only the greatest miracles could bring the Pharao of the Exodus to comply with the positive commands of Jehovah,

[1] Cfr. Prof. BRIGGS, General Introd. to the Study of Holy Scripture, p. 345; Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 372 (Engl. Transl.), etc.

[2] Cfr. VON ORELLI, the Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 173 (Engl. Transl.), Abbé TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 232, etc.

Digitized by Google

and no such miracles are even hinted at in order to account for the humble repentance of the king of Assyria. Equally untrue to life appears the description of the Ninivites who all repent at the message of an unknown individual; and the same thing must be said in regard to the order issued by the king that a fast should be observed and sackcloth worn even by the infants and beasts (cfr. Jonas iv, 5–9). (3) It is difficult to account for the utter absence of any reference to the repentance of Ninive, from the king on his throne to the humblest citizen, in the historical books of the Bible, and in the copious prophecies which deal with Assyria and its relation to Israel:[1] the extent of that conversion, the sincerity and the depth of it, if historical at all, should have supplied the monotheistic teachers of Israel with at least occasional allusions in favor of the pure worship of the true God. (4) "To those who accept the fact of miracle the marvels of the fish and the gourd are not in themselves stumbling-blocks, and a reverent faith in the supernatural of revelation will repudiate all well-meant attempts to reduce their wondrousness by unreliable travellers' stories and vagaries of natural history.[2] The real difficulty about the element of the miraculous in the book of Jonas consists, for believing minds, rather in the amount and the kind of it. From beginning to end, the narrative is one continuous chain of surprises, providences, and marvels of a very unusual description. And what is more significant still, much of it is, so far as we can perceive, unnecessary for the practical accomplishment of the matter-of-fact object assigned, while it as evi-

[1] Whenever the Assyrians are spoken of, they are described as idolaters. Indeed the fact of Ninive s conversion seems to be excluded by the following statement of the prophet Jeremias (ii, 11): "It a nation hath changed their gods and indeed they are not gods: but my people have changed their glory into an idol."

[2] Such attempts have been made by F. KAULEN, in his Comm. on Jonas; H. BONAR, art. Jonah, in SMITH, Dict. of the Bible, etc.

Digitized by Google

dently serves with unequalled effectiveness a didactic purpose, viz., to emphasize and throw into intense relief certain truths of the very first importance in revelation."[1] (5) Lastly, the fact that the book of Jonas represents a hymn which celebrates a deliverance already granted and which is "partially made up of selections from Psalms,"[2]—some of them quite late in date,[3]—as composed by the prophet while still in the fish's belly, is also often urged against the strictly historical character of the narrative.[4]

It should not be supposed that all the scholars who do not regard the book of Jonas as a matter-of-fact history consider it as a mere work of the imagination. According to several recent critics, that inspired work, like the books of Job, Tobias, Judith, etc., is not altogether fictitious. Von Orelli, for example, tells us that "the fish miracle is not the product of the author's fancy. Whether we regard it as a historical fact or assign it to legend, it was certainly matter of tradition. For it cannot easily be brought into harmony with the didactic purpose of the narrator, as is shown by the explanations of most of the expositors, who are unable to extract any special moral teaching from it. A prophetic mission of Jonas to Ninive must also have been handed down by tradition, and, indeed, in connection with that adventure; and have told the astonishing result of his preaching. In the same way, the narrator found the Jonas Psalm ready to hand. Had he himself composed it out of fragments of other prayers, as is now generally supposed, he would have introduced the Psalm, in this case also well put together, at a more fitting point."[5]

[1] W. G. ELMSLIE, in "Book by Book," p. 288. Cfr. Samuel DAVIDSON, loc. cit., p. 273; VON ORELLI, loc. cit., p. 168.
[2] VIGOUROUX, Manuel Biblique vol. ii, no. 1090, § 3.
[3] For instance Pss. cxx, 1, cxxi, 23, cxlii, 4; etc. (Cfr. VIGOUROUX ibid.)
[4] Cfr. BRIGGS, loc. cit., p. 347, Samuel DAVIDSON, loc. cit. p. 274 sqq. etc.
[5] VON ORELLI, loc. cit., p. 168. See also DRIVER, Introd., p. 324 sq.

Digitized by Google

While this view of the matter agrees with the prevalent opinion that Hebrew writers do not invent entirely their stories, and accounts for the general appearance of the narrative and for the time-honored tradition which looks upon the book of Jonas as actual history, yet most scholars who deny the historical character of the writing think that we should regard the work as a fiction the purpose of which is to enforce important religious teachings. According to some, it is a parabolic fiction somewhat similar in its narrative form and didactic purpose to the well-known parable of the Prodigal Son.[1] Others see in it an allegorical composition, wherein Jonas represents Israel fleeing from the duty imposed on the nation in its prophetic character as a witness for God.[2] The world-power represented in Isai. xxvii and Jerem. li, 34 as a sea-monster may, in accordance with God's design, swallow up Israel (Jerem. li, 34); but Bel, the god of Babylon, is forced to disgorge his prey (Jerem. li, 44) after "three days," according to Osee's way of describing the duration of the Exile (Osee vi, 2). In his second mission to Ninive Jonas symbolizes Israel restored and entrusted again with a prophetical mission. The Jewish nation preaches with sufficient readiness the doom of the Gentile world, and watches for the time when it will be fulfilled. But in His mercy God has other views than His prophetical representative; He does not delight in the death of men, but rather in their repentance. This allegorical method of interpreting the book of Jonas is steadily gaining ground among Biblical scholars [3] and is plainly in harmony with the requirements of Catholic orthodoxy. One

[1] For an able exposition of that view, see Jno. JAHN, Introd. to the Old Test., p. 373 (Engl. Transl.).

[2] Israel is God's servant, entrusted with the prophetic mission of carrying light and truth to the heathen, according to Isai. xli–lxvi.

[3] This view is admitted by DE WETTE, DELITZSCH, BLEEK, REUSS, Chas. H. H. WRIGHT, Ed. KÖNIG, Chas. A. BRIGGS, etc.

Digitized by Google

may doubt, however, whether, in so far as it denies all historical basis to the prophecy, it does not assume too "artificial a clothing of the national idea and history in a personal garb."[1] It would indeed appear more plausible if it were coupled with the view set forth above, which admits that the materials of the narrative were, at least substantially, supplied by tradition. Thus modified it would be far more probable than the theory which looks upon the book of Jonas as simply a rebuke of the selfish spirit of the Jewish people, a satire against Jewish particularism. As regards the more or less Rationalistic efforts which have been made to represent the book of Jonas as a historical myth chiefly on account of the fish miracle, it suffices to say that they have so far succeeded in proving only one thing, viz., that all such attempts have no real ground besides the wish of doing away with the reality of that miracle and of the supernatural which is inextricably woven into the framework of the narrative.[2]

"There is probably no intermediate resting-place for intelligent faith between a simple acceptance of the history, and the theory held by many believing scholars, who, influenced by no shrinking from the supernatural, but purely by the literary character and didactic bent of the story, have found in it a kind of composition similar to the book of Job, or the pictorial prophetic visions and symbolical actions recounted in the memoirs of the prophets, and which in the present case may be more exactly defined as a species of spiritual allegory or religious parable, founded on a more or less extensive basis of historical fact."[3]

4. Authorship and Date of Composition. Scholars who regard the book of Jonas as historical throughout deem

[1] VON ORELLI the Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 171 (Engl. Transl.).

[2] For details see VON ORELLI, ibid.; Ed. KÖNIG, art. Jonah, in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible; Samuel DAVIDSON, Introd., vol. iii, p. 280 sq.; etc.

[3] W. G. ELMSLIE, in "Book by Book," p. 289.

Digitized by Google

it only natural that it should have been "composed by the prophet himself," "not long after the events narrated and the return of Jonas to his mother country."[1] Their main reason for ascribing the work to the person and time of the prophet Jonas (8th cent. B.C.) consists in the ancient tradition of both Jews and Christians, which, as far as it can be traced back, has always borne witness to the authenticity of that sacred writing.[2] This tradition, we are told, was known to and endorsed by the writer of Ecclesiasticus, who praises the twelve minor prophets in exactly the same manner as he does Isaias, Jeremias, and Ezechiel. Now this shows that, according to him, one and the same tradition ascribed to those greater and minor prophets (Jonas included) the respective books which bore their names. But more particularly, the insertion of the book of Jonas among "the Prophets," or second part of the Hebrew Bible, despite the fact that it reads more like history than prophecy, is said to point back to the collectors themselves of he Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament as the origina ors of the tradition; had not the collectors been fully aware that the book o Jonas had been composed by a prophet, they would have pla d the work among "the Writings,' or third part of the Hebrew Canon, along with Ruth, Esther, etc Lastly, intrinsic evidence is appealed to as confirming the traditional view. "The author," we are told, "recounts with humility Jonas' failings, such as his disobedience to God's orders, his audacity in arguing with the Almighty, his inhumanity in wishing that the whole city of Ninive should be overthrown. Such a tone of sincerity is more befitting on the part of Jonas himself than on the part of any other, for no one besides him would have detailed

[1] KEIL Introd. to the Old Test., vol. i, p. 401 (Engl. Transl.).
[2] R. CORNELY, Introductio in S. Script., vol. ii, part ii, p. 564.

Digitized by Google

with such frankness the failings of a prophet highly venerated among the Jews."[1]

However pleasant it might be to think that in the short book of Jonas we have a piece of autobiography going back to so early a date as the eighth century B.C., it must be admitted that the foregoing arguments in favor of the authenticity of the narrative are far from convincing. The book nowhere claims to have been written by Jonas, and the narrative is throughout in the third person, that is, assumes a form which probably was not the usual one for an autobiography even among the Hebrews.[2] There is no conclusive proof that the collectors of the Hebrew Scriptures included Jonas among the prophets because they knew that he was the author of the story which bears his name. The hero of the book appears therein as entrusted with a twofold prophetical mission, as delivering an oracle of woe in Ninive, and is connected by the title of the book with one of the ancient prophets of Israel: this was certainly a sufficient reason for the collectors to insert the work among "the Prophets," so long as the prophetical collection or second Canon of the Jews was not closed. Once the book of Jonas was thus reckoned among the prophetical writings, it was only natural for subsequent Jewish writers, such as the author of Ecclesiasticus, to regard the ascription to Jonas as correct, and therefore to treat that prophet as the author of the work which bears his name. Hence the testimony of the writer of Ecclesiasticus, when closely examined, has no greater weight than that of the unknown collectors of the prophetical books. Regarding the appeal to internal evidence as bearing out the traditional

[1] CORNELY, loc. cit.; ERMONI, art. Jonas in VIGOUROUX, Diction. de la Bible, col. 1606 sq.

[2] In the extracts from the personal memoirs of Esdras and Nehemias the first person is constantly used (Esdras vii. 27, 28; viii. 1, 15–17, etc. Nehem i–vii. 5, etc.).

Digitized by Google

view, it is plain that it rests on the assumption that the narrative is a matter-of-fact history. But as this strictly historical character is far from solidly established, any inference based on it can hardly be considered as strengthened thereby. In fact, the arguments usually brought forward by the defenders of the traditional authorship are distinctly rated by them as "indecisive."[1]

Besides the fact that the narrative is in the third person and does not profess to have been written by Jonas, the following reasons are commonly set forth to deny the prophet's authorship, and even to assign to the book a much later origin. First, the style and diction are those of a late period in the Old Testament Hebrew. The work contains many Aramaisms[2] and "has a marked affinity with Ecclesiastes,"[3] that is, with a book whose characteristic features in grammar and vocabulary are decidedly late.[4] In the second place, the Psalm ascribed to Jonas in the fish's belly is borrowed in the main from passages in the Psalms, some of them, such as Ps. cxlii, certainly post-exilic. Thirdly, "the general thought and tenor of the book, which presupposes the teaching of the great prophets (comp. especially Jonas iii, 10 with Jerem. xviii, 7 sq.)."[5] Fourthly, "the phrase 'king of Ninive,' which was never used of the Assyrian kings, and the use of which, together with iii, 3, 'Ninive *was* [the Hebrew verb cannot be rendered by *is*] an exceeding great city,' implies that the Assyrian empire has long since passed away."[6] "From all this," concludes the eminent Catholic professor

[1] ERMONI, loc. cit., col. 1606. Cfr. KNABENBAUER, S.J., in Prophetas Minores, vol. i, p. 322; etc.

[2] Cfr. Jno. JAHN, Introd. to Old Test., p. 377 (Engl. Transl.); DRIVER, Introd., p. 322; etc.

[3] W. H. BENNETT and W. F. ADENEY, a Biblical Introd., p. 245.

[4] Cfr. pages 125, 126 of the present volume.

[5] DRIVER, loc. cit.

[6] W. H. BENNETT, loc. cit. See also JAHN, loc. cit.

Digitized by Google

Jahn, "it follows that the Jonas who is said to have prophesied in IV Kings xiv, 25 cannot have been the author of this book, who must have lived a long time after the year 625 B.C. when Ninive was destroyed, and even after the Babylonian captivity, when the Jews desired vehemently the chastisement of the heathen, and could scarcely bear to have it delayed, a disposition which is silently reproved in this book."[1] According to Driver, "a date in the fifth century B.C. will probably no be far wide of the truth."[2]

Whatever may be thought of the value of these and similar arguments in favor of a post-exilic date for the composition of the book of Jonas, it can be readily admitted with some recent Catholic scholars that "even though it should be proved that a late author has written and ascribed to Jonas the book which bears that prophet's name, nothing would be thereby detracted from the divine authority of his prophecy."[3]

[1] JAHN, loc. cit., p. 378.
[2] DRIVER, loc. cit.
[3] TROCHON, les Petits Prophètes, p. 220, footn. 4. Cfr. also Card. MIECHAN, les Prophètes d'Israel, p. 368.

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

Abbott, T. K., 93.
Abdias: Name and legends concerning him, 475 sq.; Contents of his Book, 476 sq.; Date of Prophecy, 477 sqq.
Adam, Psalm ascribed to, 76.
Adency, 149.
Aggeus. Name, and Traditions concerning him, 443 sq.; Contents of his Book, 444 sqq.; Style, Date and Authorship of his Prophecy, 445 sqq.
Agur, 99 sq.
Allegorical Interpretation of Canticle of Canticles, 141 sqq.
Alliteration, 26 sq.
Alphabetic, Lamentations, 295. Proverbs, 100; Strophes, 26.
Ambrose, St., 84, 133.
Amos. Name and Personal History, 393 sqq. Book of: Contents, 396 sqq.; Unity, Date and Authorship, 400 sqq.
Antiochus, Reign of, 337 sqq.
Agiba, 136, 142.
Aramaic, Aramaisms, in: Canticle of Canticles, 139 sq.; Daniel, 339, 346 sq., 357, 372; Ecclesiastes, 125; Ecclesiasticus, 176; Ezechiel, 325; Jeremias, 282; Osee, 410.
Asaph, Psalms of, 72, 79, 81.
Assonance, 26 sq.
Auberlen, 471.
Augustine, St., 84, 159, 181, 403.
Azarias, Prayer of, 379 sqq.
Bacon, B. W., 490.
Baruch: Contents, 303 sqq.: Original Language and Unity, 305 sqq. Authorship and Date, 308 sqq.
Behemoth, 41.
Bel and the Dragon, 380 sqq., 433.
Bellarmin, 57, 163.
Bennett, W. H., 39 sq., 52, 87, 99, 105 sq., 128, 140 149, 151, 210 sq., 219 sq., 227 sq., 265, 269 sq., 275 278 sqq., 285, 293, 313, 322, 328, 331 sq. 363, 407, 410, 418 428, 433, 438, 448 450 sq., 455, 477, 479, 499.
Ben Sira', see *Ecclesiasticus*.
Bevan, A. A., 308, 339 sqq., 346 sq., 361 sq., 364 sq., 367, 372 sq.
Bickell, G., 22, 37, 121, 129, 141, 185, 218.
Bissell, E. C., 160 sqq., 167, 170, 176, 306, 310, 386 sq.
Bleek, F., 285, 288, 294, 346, 363, 403, 448, 495.
Bossuet, 154 sq.
Briggs, Chas. A., 18, 23, 26, 363, 492, 494 sq.
Brown, E., 142.
Bruce, A., 192.
Bruneau, 60.
Bruston, C., 149, 152, 403.
Budde, K., 41, 44, 141, 150 sq., 288, 295, 435, 437.
Calmet, O.S.B., 154, 161, 183, 222, 275, 341 sq., 386, 403, 463, 471.
Cameron, G. G., 468.
Canticle of Canticles: Name 132, 136; Unity, 133 sqq.; Authorship and Date: Traditional View, 137 sqq.; More Recent Theories 139 sqq., Interpretation. Allegorical, 141 sqq.; Literal, 148 sqq.; Typical, 152 sqq.
Cassiodorus, 84.
Charles, R. H., 371.
Cheyne T. K., 63, 73, 88, 96 sqq., 102, 104 sq., 117, 128 sq., 140 sq., 149, 151, 210, 220 sq., 248 sq., 251, 256, 258 sq., 288, 394 sq., 402 sq., 406, 413 sqq., 426.
Chronology from 745 to 586 B.C., 207.
Ciasca, 37.
Collections, of Psalms, 80 sqq.; of Proverbs, 96 sqq.; in First Isaias, 211, 213 sqq., in Ezechiel, 329; etc.
Condamin, S.J., 119 sqq., 124 sqq., 128 sq., 164, 193, 397, 436.
Cooke, G. A., 441, 443 sq., 446.
Corluy, S.J., 70, 167, 263, 343.
Cornely, S.J., 51, 52, 88, 121, 134, 139, 159, 161, 164, 170, 181 sqq., 208, 273, 287, 290, 293, 307, 309, 346, 351, 360, 397, 456, 463, 478, 483, 497 sq.
Cornill, C. H., 41, 127, 150, 320 sq.
Council of Trent, 107.
Curci, S.J., 88.
Curtis, E. L., 370, 372, 376 sq.
Cycles of Speeches in Job, 32 sq.

Digitized by Google

Cyrus 227, 232 sq., 244 sq., 250, 336, 365, 372, 381, 440, 442, 449.

Damasus, St., 68.
Daniel, Place in the Canon, 334 Life, 335 sq.; Proto-Canonical Parts. Contents, 338 sqq.; Didactic Purpose, 344; Literary Unity, 345; Authorship and Date, 347 sqq.
Deutero-Canonical Parts. Contents and Place in Versions, 379 sqq.; Original Language, 383; Authorship, 384 sqq.
Danko, 52, 386.
David, see *Psalms*.
Davidson, A. B., 39 sqq., 47, 103 sq., 106, 149, 190, 259, 275, 288, 290 sq., 293, 404 sq., 407 sq., 425, 427, 431 sq., 432, 436 sq., 471.
Davidson, Samuel, 41 sq., 47, 52, 57, 74, 93, 102, 134, 147 sq., 166, 170, 175, 179, 183 sq., 284 sq., 287, 306, 310, 321, 346, 350, 383, 409, 413, 458 sq., 483, 486, 488, 490, 494, 498.
Davison, W. T., 52 sq.
Deane, W. J., 91, 164 sqq., 346, 357, 359 sq.
Delitzsch, Frz., 52, 66, 70, 88, 97, 126, 148, 154, 212, 217 sq., 221, 239, 241, 247 sqq., 252 sqq., 274, 361, 363, 402, 495.
Deutero-Isaias, 53; see *Isaias*.
De Wette, 73, 135, 183, 283, 306, 363, 454, 471, 495.
Didactic Books: Names, 13; Doctrinal Purpose, 14; Poetical Features, 15 sqq.
Dillmann, 37, 258.
Douglas, G. C. M., 124.
Doxologies, 60, 77 sq.
Driver, 24, 34, 42, 44, 50, 52 sq., 56, 72, 74 sq., 83 sq., 86 sq., 92, 97 sq. 102, 110 119, 125 sqq., 140 sq., 148 sq., 207, 209 sqq., 216 sqq., 241, 245, 282, 284, 288 sqq., 293 sq., 299 sqq., 310 sq., 316, 323, 330, 335, 337, 341 sqq., 346, 350, 354, 361, 363, 365, 367, 370 sqq., 386, 400, 402, 406, 408, 417, etc.
Duhm, 37, 39 sq., 210, 471.

Eben Ezra, 235, 403.
Ecclesiastes: Names, 110 sq., Place in the Canon, 111 sq.; Contents, 112 sqq.; Authorship discussed, 116 sqq.; Integrity, 128 sq.
Ecclesiasticus, Prologue to, 63, 88, 173, 182.
—Book of Names, 172 sq.; Contents, 173 sqq.; Original Text, 175 sqq.; Ancient Versions, 178 sqq.; Authorship, 181 sqq.; Mode of Composition, 183 sqq.
Eichhorn, 363, 384.
Eliu, 43 sqq.
Elmslie, W. G., 453, 461, 494, 496.
Elohim Psalms, 80, etc.
Enoch, Book of, 371, 376.
Ephrem, St., 51.
Ermoni, 207, 214 sqq., 232, 274, 281, 485, 498 sq.
Esdras, 76, 88, 349 sq., etc.
Estius, 343, 403.
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 18, 20 sq., 133, 386 sq.
Ewald, 52, 73, 97, 281, 306, 363, 403, 417, 471.
Ezechias, 87, 99, 104, 119, 207, 219, 242.
Ezechiel: Name and Life, 313 sqq.; Hebrew Text, 320 sqq.; Style and Language, 322 sqq.; Authorship and Date, 325 sqq.; Manner of Origin, 328 sqq.; Literary and Religious Influence, 330 sqq.

Fillion, 60, 145, 174 252, 274.
Forbes Jno., 235 sq.

Geikie, C., 354 sq.
Gesenius, 52, 363.
Gietmann, S.J., 133, 135, 156.
Gilly, 360, 384, 386 sqq.
Gray, 330.
Gregory of Nyssa, St., 21, 143 154.
Grotius (De Groot), 118 121, 154, 161.

Habacuc: Name and Legends concerning him 432 sq.; Contents of his Book, 433 sqq.; Date and Authorship of his Prophecy, 436 sqq.
Haggada, 378.
Hagiographa, 30, 64, 130, 139, 334, 374.
Hanneberg, 91, 115, 170, 192, 245, 263, 281, 290 306, 308, 345, 363, 471, 478.
Hardouin, S.J., 343.
Harper, W. R., 396 sqq.
Hatch, H. R., 404.
Haupt, P., 37, 129, 141 150, 363.
Hengstenberg, 48, 252, 375, 471.
Hexaplar Psalter, 67 sq., 306.
Historical Introduction to Aggeus and Zacharias, 440 sqq.
Houbigant, 161.
Huet, 163.
Hupfeld, 73.

Isaias: Life and Times, 204 sqq.
—Two parts, 208 sqq.; *First Isaias*. Prophetical Part: Structure and Contents, 210 sqq. Method of Composition, 214 sqq.; Date 218. Historical Appendix: Contents 220; Relation to IV Kings, 220 sqq.; Authorship, 222 sqq.
Deutero-Isaias, 208, 226, 229, etc. Contents, 226 sqq.: Reasons for Isaianic Authorship 230 sqq.; Reasons *against* Isaianic Authorship, 249 sqq.
Israel and Juda during the Eighth Century B.C., 390 sqq.
Itala, see *Latin Versions*.

Jahn, 19, 35, 59, 97, 122, 124, 127, 150, 284, 287, 296, 306, 317, 327, 339, 341 sq., 345 350, 383, 401, 407, 415, 445 sq., 464, 466, 471, 478, 497, 499 sq.

Digitized by Google

Jamnia, 130, 136.
Jansenius, 154.
Jason, 181.
Jeremias: Life and Times, 267 sqq.; Contents, 269 sqq.; Authorship 279 sqq.; Second Edition, 271 sq.. Hebrew Text and Septuagint compared, 290 sqq.
Jerome, St., 20, 37, 67 sqq., 90, 96, 111 159, 163, 165, 172, 179, 269, 300, 306, 309, 363, 386, 403, 411, 432, 445, 448, 463, 468, 482.
Job: Name, 29; Position in the Canon, 29 sq.; Contents, 31 sqq.; Integrity, 36 sqq.; Purpose, 46 sqq., Historical Character, 48 sqq.; Author 51, Date of Composition, 52 sqq.
Joel: Name and Life, 468 sq.; Contents of his Book, 469 sq.; Date of Prophecy, 470 sqq.
Johnston, D., 118, 126.
Jonas: Name and Personal Life, 481 sqq.; Contents of Book, 483 sq.; Historical Character and Probable Object, 484 sqq.; Authorship and Date 496 sqq.
Jones, W., 21 sq.
Josephus, 20 sq., 167, 232 sqq., 298, 343, 349, 374.

Kaulen Fr., 52, 121, 125 sq., 183, 352, 456 471, 487, 493.
Kautzsch, E., 40, 52, 150 288, 290, 332, 363 461, 471, 475.
Kay, 236, 238, 248.
Keil, 74, 88, 125, 134, 137 sqq., 218 sq., 274, 281, 286, 290 324, 349 sqq., 358, 360, 403, 456, 462 sq., 485 sq. 497.
Kennedy, A. R. S., 422 sqq.
K*thubhim, see *Hagiographa.*
Kirkpatrick, A. F., 59, 62, 65, 70, 72 sq., 75 87 sq.
Kittel, R., 330.
Knabenbauer, S.J., 41, 211, 221 sq., 239, 244, 281, 284, 286, 290, 293, 322, 330, 338, 342 sq., 346, 351, 365 368, 383, 445, 478, 499.
König, F. E., 148, 361, 363, 489 495 sq.
Köster, 24.
Kuenen, 127, 288, 328, 346, 403, 471.
Kurtz, 403.

Lamentations: Title, 293; Place in the Canon, 294, Literary Form, 294 sqq.; Contents, 296 sq.; Authorship examined, 297 sqq.
Lamuel, 100.
Latin Versions of, Psalms, 67 sqq.; Proverbs, 96, Ecclesiastes, 111, Wisdom, 158 sq.; Ecclesiasticus, 179 sq.; etc.
Le Hir, 22, 44 sq., 209.
Lenormant, F., 354, 360 368.
Lesêtre, H., 41, 49 sqq., 51, 59, 61 sqq., 65, 70, 73, 75, 88, 90, 92, 100 sq., 119, 135, 137, 139 sq., 144 sqq., 158, 163, 172, 180, 184, 208, 219, 274, 346, 384, 386, 405, 453, 455 sq., 463 478.
Leviathan, 42.
Levitical Collections of Psalms, 81 sqq.
Lewis, Mrs. 176.
Literal Interpretation of Canticle of Canticles 148 sqq.
Literary Analogy between Proverbs and Psalter 107 sq.
Loisy, 41 sqq., 52 121.
Lowe, W. H., 455, 463.
Lowth, 15 sqq. 51, 154, 193 214, 295.
Luther 54 118.

Machabean Psalms, 76 sqq.
Maimonides, 48 403.
Malachias: Name and Times, 461 sqq., Contents of his Book, 464 sq., Style and Approximate Date, 465 sq.
Margoliouth, 176 sqq.
Mariana, S.J., 154.
Marshall, J. T. 304 sqq., 310.
Marti, 210.
Mashal, 92.
Massoretic Text of, Job, 36 sq.; Psalms, 60 sqq.; Proverbs, 93 sqq.; Jeremias, 291 sqq.; Daniel, 348, etc.; Nahum, 423; Sophonias, 431.
McCurdy, J. F., 330.
McSwiney, S.J., 70, 73.
Mede, Jos., 459.
Meignan (Card.), 115, 154, 156 218, 227, 243 sq., 252, 265, 489, 500.
Melchisedech, Psalm ascribed to, 76.
Menant, 353, 360.
Menochius, S.J., 403.
Merz A., 37, 48 471.
Metre in Hebrew Poetry 20 sqq.
Micheas: Name and Personal History, 411 sq.; Contents of Book of, 412 sqq.; Date and Authorship of Prophecy of, 415 sqq.
Moral Writings, *see* Didactic Books.
Moses, Psalm ascribed to, 76.
Motais, 115, 117 sq.
Movers, M. C., 121, 273, 281, 284, 287, 290.
Muratorian Canon, 165.

Nahum: Name and Birthplace, 422 sq., Contents of Book of, 423 sq.; Date and Authorship of Prophecy of, 424 sqq.
Neteler, 208, 301 sq.
Neubauer, 176.
Newman (Card.), 218, 265, 311, 379.
Nöldeke, 127 361.
Nowack, 129, 402, 416.
Numbering of Psalms, 71.
Olshausen 73.
Origen, 37, 60, 76, 133, 142 sq., 149, 153, 403.
Osee Name and Life, 401 sqq.; Contents of Book of, 405 sqq.; Authorship, Integrity and Text of Prophecy of, 408 sqq.
Ottley, 199, 202, 208, 392, 421 471, 475.

Parallelism, Definition of,

Digitized by Google

15. Principal Kinds, 16 sqq., in Proverbs, 97, in Prophets 193, etc.
Patrizi, S.J., 88.
Peake, A. S., 126 sqq.
Pelt, J. B., 106, 134 sq., 150, 164, 170, 183, 190, 192.
Perowne, J. J. S., 61, 75.
—T. T., 445, 450, 454, 462, 465, 478, 480.
Philippe, E., 59, 114, 309 sq., 314, 320, 348, 351, 355 sq., 358, 366, 372, 374 sq., 396, 401, 445 sq., 477.
Philo, 20 sq., 164 sqq., 170.
Pilgrim Psalms, 17.
Pineda, S.J., 154.
Plumptre, 129, 246, 271, 403.
Poetical Books, see *Didactic Books.*
Prat, S.J., 121, 311.
Prayer of Azarias, 379 sqq.
Prince, 355, 363, 365.
Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, 63, 88, 173, 182.
Proverbs: Names, 90, 107 sq.; Original Text and Ancient Versions, 93 sqq., Gradual Formation, 96 sqq.; Authorship, 100 sqq., 119 sq. Date, 102 sqq.; Literary Analogy with Psalter, 107 sq.
Psalms: Names, 56; General Contents, 57 sqq.; Original Text 60; Septuagint Version, 64 sqq.; Latin Versions 67 sqq.; Other Ancient Versions, 70; Numbering of, 71; Titles of 71 sqq. Gradual Formation, 76 sqq.; Machabean, 76, 87; Division into Five Books, 60, 77; Double Recension of, 78; Elohistic, Yahwistic Collections, 80 sqq.; Authorship of Davidic Collections, 82 sqq.; Date of Completion of Psalter, 87 sqq.
Psalterium, Gallicanum, 69; Romanum, 68, Ex Hebræo, 69 sq., 76.
Pusey, 349 sq., 358, 403.

Qoheleth, see *Ecclesiastes.*

Rault, 379, 386.
Refrain, 26, 208.
Renan, 127.
Reusch, 306, 386.
Reuss, E., 40, 48, 288, 403, 495.
Rhyme 26 sq.
Ribera, S.J., 463.
Rufinus, 403.
Ryle, H. E., 30, 112, 294, 334, 384.

Salmon, G., 117, 119, 124 sq.
Samaritans, 441.
Sanday, W., 91 273, 490.
Sapiential Books, see *Didactic Books.*
Satan, 31, 39, 48, 53.
Sayce, 363, 366 sq., 373, 480.
Schaff, P., 61.
Schechter, 178.
Schegg, 88, 403.
Scheil, O. P., 425.
Scholz, 101, 285.
Schrader, E., 365.
Schürer, E., 160, 182 sq., 184, 310.
Selah, 26, 436.
Selbie, J. A., 370, 377, 429 sqq.
Septuagint Version of, Job, 37, Psalms, 64 sqq.; Proverbs, 94 sqq.; etc.
Servant of Yahweh, 227 sq., 261, 269.
Seventy, Years in Jeremias, 283.
—Weeks in Daniel, 342 sq.
Shammai, 117, 153.
Simon, Richard, 39.
Sixtus of Sienna O.P., 343.
Skinner, 319 sq. 325 sq., 332.
Smith, Geo. A., 205 210 sq., 213, 218, 249 sq., 394, 435.
—W. R., 75 sq., 82 sq., 85, 87, 149, 192, 297, 300, 327, 395 404 411, 445, 462, 464, 466.
Solomon Proverbs of, 90, 97 99
—not the Author of the whole Book of Proverbs, 100 sqq.
Song of Songs, see *Canticle of Canticles.*
Son of Sirach, see *Ecclesiasticus.*
Sons of Core, Psalms of, 72, 79, 81.
Sophonias, Name and Royal Descent of, 427 sq.; Contents of his Book, 428 sq.; Date and Authorship of his Prophecy, 429 sqq.; Literary Characteristics and Condition of Text of his Book, 431.
Soto, O.P., 154.
Souciet, S.J., 345.
Strophes, Hebrew, 24 sqq.
Suzanna, History of, 379 sqq.
Swete, H. B., 66, 100, 134, 158, 172, 178, 180, 199, 390.
Syriac Version of Proverbs, 95; of Ecclesiasticus 180 sq.; etc.

Talmud, 30, 48, 57, 90, 117, 119, 218, 234, 327.
Teraphim 457.
Theodore of Mopsuestia 143.
Theodoret, 143, 154, 403.
Thomas (St.) of Aquin, 84, 403.
Titles of Psalms, 71 sqq.
Touzard, J., 175, 177 sqq., 181, 183, 193, 403, 412.
Toy, C. H., 90, 92 sq., 95, 97, 106, 176, 178 sqq., 183 sq., 313 sq., 317 sq., 321, 325 sqq.
Trent, Council of, 107.
Trochon, 194, 219, 221 sqq., 274, 276, 279, 281, 286, 288, 290, 309, 322, 335, 338, 343, 346, 363, 365, 374, 381, 383, 385, 396, 402, 412 sq., 427, 436, 438, 444 sq., 448 sq., 459, 462, 465, 471 476 sqq., 483, 486, 491 sq., 500.
Typical Interpretation of Canticle of Canticles, 152 sqq.

Urwick 239 sqq. 232 248, 252.

Van Steenkiste, 70, 88.
Verse Hebrew, 1[illegible] sqq.
Versions see *Latin. Septuagint*, etc.

Digitized by Google

Vigouroux, 18 sq., 30, 45, 50 sq., 59, 69, 73, 80, 95, 97, 115, 119, 164, 170, 192, 214 sq., 218 sq., 274 sqq., 325, 346, 348, 352, 354, 360, 384, 386 sq., 403, 410, 429, 436, 444, 450, 471, 478, 483 sq., 494.
Vogel, 73.
Von Orelli, 215, 221 sq., 235, 280 sq., 284, 287, 293, 396, 402, 412, 415, 492, 494.

Welte, 52, 101, 170.
Westcott, 160, 184, 346, 348.
Wetzstein, 150.
Wildeboer, 127, 129, 232, 322.
Wisdom, 91, etc.
—Book of, 120; Title, 158 sq.; Contents, 159 sqq.; Original Language, 161 sqq.; Authorship, 162 sqq.; Date and Place of Composition, 166 sqq.
Wisdom of Jesus, see *Ecclesiasticus*.
Wogue, L., 93, 117, 133 sq., 137, 234, 362.
Wright, Chas. H. H., 39, 111, 115, 119, 122 sq., 126 sqq., 169, 448 sqq., 453, 456, 459, 495.
—W. A., 22, 90, 92, 105, 446.

Yahweh Psalms, 80 sqq.

Zacharias: Name, and Legends concerning him, 448 sq.; Contents of his Prophecy, 449 sqq.; Date and Authorship of his Book, 451 sqq.
Zenner, S.J., 121.
Zorobabel, 440 sq., 444, 447, 449.

PRINTED BY BENZIGER BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

BOOKS OF DOCTRINE, INSTRUCTION, DEVOTION, MEDITATION, BIOGRAPHY, NOVELS, JUVENILES, ETC.

PUBLISHED BY

BENZIGER BROTHERS

CINCINNATI:	NEW YORK:	CHICAGO:
343 MAIN ST.	36-38 BARCLAY ST.	214-216 W. MONROE ST.

Books not marked *net* will be sent postpaid on receipt of the advertised price. Books marked *net* are such where ten per cent must be added for postage. Thus a book advertisd at *net* $1.00 will be sent postpaid on receipt of $1.10.

DOCTRINE, INSTRUCTION, ETC.

ABANDONMENT; or, Absolute Surrender of Self to Divine Providence. CAUSSADE, S.J. *net*, 0 50
ADORATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, THE TESNIÈRE. 0 50
ANECDOTES AND EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATING THE CATHOLIC CATECHISM. SPIRAGO. *net*, 1 50
ANGELS OF THE SANCTUARY. MUSSER. *net*, 0 15
APOSTLES' CREED. MÜLLER, C.SS.R *net*, 1 10
ART OF PROFITING BY OUR FAULTS. ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. *net*, 0 50
AUTOBIOGRAPY OF ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA. O'CONOR. *net*, 1 25
BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. SHAHAN. *net*, 2 00
BLESSED SACRAMENT BOOK. LASANCE 1 50
BLOSSOMS OF THE CROSS. GIEHRL. 12mo. 1 25
BOOK OF THE PROFESSED. 3 volumes, each, *net*, 0 75
BOY-SAVERS' GUIDE. QUIN, S.J. *net*, 1 35
BREAD OF LIFE. WILLAM. 0 75
CAMILLUS DE LELLIS. By A SISTER OF MERCY. *net*, 1 00
CASES OF CONSCIENCE. SLATER, S.J. 2 vols. *net*, 3 50
CATECHISM EXPLAINED, THE. SPIRAGO-CLARKE. *net*, 2 50
CATHOLIC BELIEF. FAÀ DI BRUNO. 16mo, paper, *net*, 0.15; cloth, *net*, 0 35
CATHOLIC CEREMONIES. DURAND. Paper, 0.25; Cloth, 0 50
CATHOLIC GIRL'S GUIDE. LASANCE. 1 25
CATHOLIC HOME ANNUAL. 0 25
CATHOLIC PRACTICE AT CHURCH AND AT HOME. KLAUDER. Paper, 0.30; Cloth, 0 60
CATHOLIC'S READY ANSWER. HILL, S.J. *net*, 2 00
CEREMONIAL FOR ALTAR BOYS. BRITT, O.S.B. *net*, 0 35
CHARACTERISTICS AND RELIGION OF MODERN SOCIALISM. MING, S.J. *net*, 1 50
CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUE DEVOTION. GROU, S.J. *net*, 0 75
CHARITY THE ORIGIN OF EVERY BLESSING. *net*, 0 50
CHILD PREPARED FOR FIRST COMMUNION. ZULUETA, S.J. Paper. 0 05
CHRIST IN TYPE AND PROPHECY. MAAS, S.J. 2 vols. *net*, 4 00
CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS. DEVIVIER-MESSMER. *net*, 2 00
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. O'CONNELL. *net*, 0 60
CHRISTIAN FATHER. CRAMER-LAMBERT. 0 50
CHRISTIAN MOTHER. CRAMER. 0 50
CHURCH AND HER ENEMIES. MÜLLER, C.SS.R. *net*, 1 10
COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. (Ps. I-L.) BERRY. *net*, 2 00

Digitized by Google

CORRECT THING FOR CATHOLICS. Bugg. 0 75
COUNSELS OF ST. ANGELA. *net,* 0 25
DEVOTIONS AND PRAYERS BY ST. ALPHONSUS. Ward. 1 25
DEVOTIONS AND PRAYERS FOR THE SICK-ROOM. Krebs. 0 50
DEVOTIONS TO THE SACRED HEART. Huguet. 0 35
DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. Noldin-Kent. *net,* 1 25
DIVINE GRACE. Wirth. 0 50
DIVINE OFFICE. St. Alphonsus Liguori. *net,* 1 50
ECCLESIASTICAL DICTIONARY. Thein. *net,* 5 00
EDUCATION OF OUR GIRLS. Shields. *net,* 1 00
EUCHARIST AND PENANCE. Müller, C.SS.R. *net,* 1 10
EUCHARISTIC CHRIST. Tesnière. *net,* 1 25
EUCHARISTIC LILIES. Maery. *net,* 1 00
EXPLANATION OF BIBLE HISTORY. Nash. *net,* 1 60
EXPLANATION OF CATHOLIC MORALS. Stapleton. 0 50
EXPLANATION OF BALTIMORE CATECHISM. Kinkead. *net,* 1 00
EXPLANATION OF THE COMMANDMENTS. Müller. *net,* 1 10
EXPLANATION OF THE COMMANDMENTS. Rolfus. 0 50
EXPLANATION OF THE CREED. Rolfus. 0 50
EXPLANATION OF GOSPELS AND OF CATHOLIC WORSHIP. Lambert-Brennan. Paper, 0.25; Cloth, 0 50
EXPLANATION OF THE HOLY SACRAMENTS. Rolfus. 0 50
EXPLANATION OF THE MASS. Cochem. 0 50
EXPLANATION OF THE PRAYERS AND CEREMONIES OF THE MASS. Lanslots, O.S.B. 0 50
EXPLANATION OF THE SALVE REGINA. St. Alphonsus Liguori. *net,* 0 75
EXTREME UNCTION. Phillip.. Paper, 0 07
FLOWERS OF THE PASSION. 32mo. 0 50
FOLLOWING OF CHRIST. Thomas à Kempis. Leather. 1 00
FOLLOWING OF CHRIST. Thomas à Kempis. Plain Edition. 0 40
FOR FREQUENT COMMUNICANTS. Roche. Paper, 0 10
FOUR LAST THINGS. Cochem. *net,* 0 75
FUNDAMENTALS OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. Schleuter. *net,* 0 60
GENERAL CONFESSION MADE EASY. Konings. C.SS.R. 0 15
GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. Gigot. *net,* 3 00
GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. Abridged Edition. Gigot. *net,* 1 75
GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIFE. Verheyen. *net,* 0 50
GENTLEMAN, A. Egan. 0 75
GIFT OF THE KING. Religious H. C. J. 0 35
GLORIES AND TRIUMPHS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. 2 00
GLORIES OF MARY. St. Alphonsus Liguori. 0.50. Edition in two volumes. *net,* 3 00
GLORIES OF THE SACRED HEART. Hausherr. S.J. 0 50
GOD, CHRIST, AND THE CHURCH. Hammer, O.F.M. 2 00
GOFFINE'S DEVOUT INSTRUCTIONS. 1 00
GREAT ENCYCLICAL LETTERS OF POPE LEO XIII. *net,* 2 50
GREAT MEANS OF SALVATION. St. Alphonsus Liguori. *net,* 1 50
GREETINGS TO THE CHRIST-CHILD. 0 60
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES. Burns. *net,* 1 75
GUIDE FOR SACRISTANS. *net,* 0 85
HANDBOOK OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Wilmers. *net,* 1 50
HARMONY OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. Heuser. *net,* 1 25
HEAVEN OPEN TO SOULS. Semple, S.J. *net,* 2 00
HELP FOR THE POOR SOULS, Ackermann. 0 60
HELPS TO A SPIRITUAL LIFE. Schneider. 0 50
HIDDEN TREASURE. St. Leonard. 0 50
HISTORY OF ECONOMICS. Dewe. *net,* 1 50
HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE IN ROME. Brann. *net,* 2 00
HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Alzog. 3 vols. *net,* 8 00
HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Businger-Brennan. 2 00
HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Brueck. 2 vols. *net,* 3 00
HISTORY OF THE MASS. O'Brien. *net,* 1 25
HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION. Gasquet. 0 50
HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. Kempf-Breymann. *net,* 1 75

Digitized by Google

HOLY BIBLE, THE. Ordinary Edition, Cloth, 1.25, and in finer bindings up to 5.00. India Paper Edition, 3.50 to 6 00
HOLY EUCHARIST. St. Alphonsus Liguori. *net,* 1 50
HOLY HOUR, THE. Keiley. 0 15
HOLY HOUR OF ADORATION. Stang. 0 60
HOLY MASS, St. Alphonsus Liguori. *net,* 1 50
HOLY VIATICUM OF LIFE AS OF DEATH. Dever. Paper, 0.25; Cloth, 0 60
HOW TO COMFORT THE SICK. Krebs, C.SS.R. 0 50
HOW TO MAKE THE MISSION. Dominican Father. Paper, 0 10
IMITATION OF CHRIST. See "Following of Christ."
IMITATION OF THE SACRED HEART. Arnoudt. 1 25
INCARNATION, BIRTH AND INFANCY OF JESUS CHRIST. St. Alphonsus Liguori. *net,* 1 50
IN HEAVEN WE KNOW OUR OWN. Blot, S.J. *net,* 0 60
INDEX TO WORKS OF ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Geiermann, C.SS.R. Paper. *net,* 0 10
INSTRUCTIONS ON THE COMMANDMENTS. St. Alphonsus Liguori. Cloth. 0 50
INTERIOR OF JESUS AND MARY. Grou, S.J. 2 vols. *net,* 2 00
INTRODUCTION TO A DEVOUT LIFE. St. Francis de Sales. 0 50
LADY, A. Bugg. 0 75
LAWS OF THE KING. Religious H. C. J. 0 35
LESSONS OF THE SAVIOUR. Religious H. C. J. 0 35
LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Grimm, C.SS.R. 5 vols., each. *net,* 1 50
LIFE OF MOTHER GUERIN. *net,* 2 00
LIFE OF BLESSED MARGARET MARY ALACOQUE. Bougaud. 0 50
LIFE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. Rohner-Brennan. 0 50
LIFE OF CHRIST. Businger-Brennan. *net,* 10 00
LIFE OF CHRIST. Cochem-Hammer. 0 50
LIFE OF CHRIST. Businger. 2 00
LIFE OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. 2 00
LIFE OF MADEMOISELLE LE GRAS. 0 50
LIFE OF ST. CATHARINE OF SIENNA. Aymé 1 00
LIFE OF ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA. Genelli, S.J. 0 50
LIFE OF SISTER ANNE KATHARINE EMMERICH. Wegener-McGowan. *net,* 1 75
LITTLE ALTAR BOY'S MANUAL. 0 20
LITTLE LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Berthold. 0 60
LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. ANTHONY. 0 15
LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. JOSEPH. Lings. 0 15
LITTLE MANUAL OF ST. RITA. McGrath. Cloth, 0.50; Leather, 0 85
LITTLE MASS BOOK, Lynch. Paper, 0 05
LITTLE MONTH OF MAY. 0 35
LITTLE MONTH OF THE SOULS IN PURGATORY. 0 35
LITTLE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. Edition in Latin and English. Cloth, *net,* 0.75 and in finer bindings up to *net,* 1.50. Edition in Latin only, Cloth, *net,* 0.60 and in finer bindings up to *net,* 1 50
LITTLE OFFICE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. Paper, 0 05
LITTLE PICTORIAL LIVES OF THE SAINTS. 1 25
LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Butler. 0 50
LOURDES. Clarke, S.J. 0 50
MANUAL OF SELF-KNOWLEDGE AND CHRISTIAN PERFECTION, A. Henry, C.SS.R. 0 50
MANUAL OF THEOLOGY FOR THE LAITY. Geiermann, C.SS.R. Paper. 0.30; Cloth, 0 60
MANUAL OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. Lasance. 0 85
MANUAL OF THE HOLY NAME. 0 50
MANUAL OF THE SACRED HEART. 0 35
MARY HELP OF CHRISTIANS. Hammer, O.F.M. 2 00
MARY THE QUEEN. Religious H. C. J. 0 35
MASS AND VESTMENTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. Walsh. *net,* 1 75
MASS DEVOTIONS AND READINGS ON THE MASS. Lasance. 0 85

Digitized by Google

MASS-SERVER'S CARD. Per doz. 0 35
MEANS OF GRACE. BRENNAN. 3 00
MEDITATIONS FOR ALL THE DAYS OF THE YEAR. HAMON, S.S. 5 vols. *net*, 5 00
MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. BAXTER. *net*, 1 50
MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. VERCRUYSSE, S.J. 2 vols. *net*, 3 50
MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE MONTH. NEPVEU-RYAN. 0 50
MEDITATIONS ON THE LAST WORDS FROM THE CROSS. PERRAUD. *net*, 0 50
MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE, THE TEACHING, AND THE PASSION OF JESUS CHRIST. ILG-CLARKE. 2 vols. *net*, 3 50
MEDITATIONS ON THE MYSTERIES OF OUR HOLY FAITH. BARRAUD, S.J. 2 vols. *net*, 3 00
MEDITATIONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR LORD. 0 50
MEDITATIONS ON THE SUFFERINGS OF JESUS CHRIST. PERINALDO. 0 50
MIDDLE AGES. SHAHAN. *net*, 2 00
MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS OF ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. *net*, 1 50
MISSAL EXPLAINED, THE. FLEURY, S.J. *net*, 1 85
MISSION BOOK FOR THE MARRIED. GIRARDEY. C.SS.R. 0 50
MISSION BOOK FOR THE SINGLE. GIRARDEY, C.SS.R. 0 50
MOMENTS BEFORE THE TABERNACLE. RUSSELL, S.J. *net*, 0 50
MORAL PRINCIPLES AND MEDICAL PRACTICE. COPPENS, S.J. 12mo. *net*, 1 00
MORALITY OF MODERN SOCIALISM. MING, S.J. *net*, 1 50
MORE SHORT SPIRITUAL READINGS FOR MARY'S CHILDREN. MADAME CECILIA. 0 50
MY PRAYER-BOOK. LASANCE. Imitation leather, 1.25; India paper, 2.00. With Epistles and Gospels, India paper, 2 25
NAMES THAT LIVE IN CATHOLIC HEARTS. SADLIER. 0 50
NARROW WAY. GEIERMANN, C.SS.R. 0 60
NEW MANUAL OF ST. ANTHONY. 0 50
NEW MISSAL FOR EVERY DAY. LASANCE. Imitation leather, Gold edges, 1.75, and in finer bindings. 1 50
NEW TESTAMENT. Cloth, 0.50; American Seal, *net*, 1.50. Plain Edition, *net*, 0.20; and in finer bindings up to *net*, 0.60. Plain Edition, Illustrated, *net*, 0.60. Illustrated Edition. India paper, Am. Seal, *net*, 0.75, and in finer bindings up to *net*, 1 60
OFFICE OF HOLY WEEK. *net*, 0 20
OUR FAVORITE DEVOTIONS. LINGS. 0 75
OUR FAVORITE NOVENAS. LINGS. 0 75
OUTLINES OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. HUNTER. 3 vols. *net*, 4 50
OUTLINES OF JEWISH HISTORY, from Abraham to Our Lord. GIGOT. 8 vo. *net*, 1 75
OUTLINES OF NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY. GIGOT. *net*, 1 75
PARADISE ON EARTH OPENED TO ALL. NATALE, S.J. *net*, 0 50
PASSION AND THE DEATH OF JESUS CHRIST. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. *net*, 1 50
PASTORAL LETTERS. MCFAUL. *net*, 1 50
PATRON SAINTS FOR CATHOLIC YOUTH. MANNIX. Each vol. 0 60
PEARLS FROM FABER. BRUNOWE. 0 35
PICTORIAL LIVES OF THE SAINTS. 3 00
POLICEMEN'S AND FIREMEN'S COMPANION. MCGRATH. Cloth, 0.25; American Seal, 0 50
POLITICAL AND MORAL ESSAYS. RICKABY, S.J. *net*, 1 75
POPULAR LIFE OF ST. TERESA. PORTER. 0 50
PRAYER-BOOK FOR RELIGIOUS. LASANCE. Cloth, *net*, 1.50; American Seal, *net*, 2 50
PREACHING. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. *net*, 1 50
PREPARATION FOR DEATH. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. *net*, 1 50
PRINCIPLES, ORIGIN, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM. BURNS. *net*, 1 75
PRIVATE RETREAT FOR RELIGIOUS. GEIERMANN, C.SS.R. *net*, 1 50
QUEEN'S FESTIVALS, THE. RELIGIOUS H. C. J. 0 35
RAMBLES IN CATHOLIC LANDS. BARRETT, O.S.B. *net*, 2 00

Digitized by Google

REASONABLENESS OF CATHOLIC CEREMONIES AND PRACTICES. BURKE. Paper, 0.15; Cloth, 0 35
RELIGIOUS STATE. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. *net*, 0 50
ROMA. Pagan, Subterranean, and Modern Rome in Word and Picture. KUHN. Cloth, *net*, 10.00; Full red morocco, *net*, 16 00
ROMAN CURIA AS IT NOW EXISTS. MARTIN, S.J. *net*, 1 50
ROMAN MISSAL. Embossed cloth, and in finer bindings, *net*, 1 85
ROSARY, THE CROWN OF MARY. DOMINICAN FATHER. Paper, 0 10
RULES OF LIFE FOR THE PASTOR OF SOULS. SLATER-RAUCH. *net*, 1 00
SACRAMENTALS OF THE CHURCH. LAMBING. Paper, 0.25; Cloth, 0 50
SACRED HEART BOOK. LASANCE. Im. leather, 0.85; Am. Seal, 1 25
SACRED HEART STUDIED IN THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. SAINTRAIN, C.SS.R. 0 50
SACRIFICE OF THE MASS WORTHILY CELEBRATED. CHAIGNON-GOESBRIAND. *net*, 1 75
ST. ANTHONY. KELLER. *net*, 0 75
ST. ANTHONY. WARD. 0 50
SAINT FRANCIS OF ASSISI. DUBOIS, S.M. 0 50
SAINTS AND PLACES. AYSCOUGH. *net*, 1 50
SANCTUARY BOYS' ILLUSTRATED MANUAL. MCCALLEN. *net*, 0 50
SCAPULAR MEDAL. GEIERMANN, C.SS.R. Paper, 0 05
SECRET OF SANCTITY. MCMAHON. 0 50
SERAPHIC GUIDE. 0 60
SHORT CONFERENCES ON THE SACRED HEART. BRINKMEYER. 0 50
SHORT COURSE IN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE. Paper, 0 10
SHORT HISTORY OF MORAL THEOLOGY. SLATER. *net*, 0 50
SHORT LIVES OF THE SAINTS. DONNELLY. 0 60
SHORT MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY. LASAUSSE. 0 50
SHORT STORIES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. MCMAHON. *net*, 1 00
SHORT VISITS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. LASANCE. Cloth, 0 15
SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY. STANG. *net*, 1 00
SOCIALISM: ITS THEORETICAL BASIS AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION. CATHREIN-GETTELMANN. *net*, 1 50
SODALIST'S VADE MECUM. 0 40
SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' COMPANION. MCGRATH. Cloth, 0.25; American Seal, 0 50
SPECIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. GIGOT. Part I, *net*, 1.75; Part II, *net*, 2 25
SPIRAGO'S METHOD OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. MESSMER. *net*, 1 50
SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE. THE. AND THE LIFE OF SACRIFICE IN THE RELIGIOUS STATE. GIRAUD-THURSTON. *net*, 2 00
SPIRITUAL CONSIDERATIONS. BUCKLER, O.P. 0 50
SPIRITUAL DESPONDENCY AND TEMPTATIONS. MICHEL-GARESCHÉ. *net*, 1 25
SPIRITUAL EXERCISES FOR A TEN DAYS' RETREAT. SMETANA, C.SS.R. *net*, 0 75
SPIRITUAL PEPPER AND SALT. STANG. Paper. 0.30; Cloth, 0 60
SPOILING THE DIVINE FEAST. ZULUETA, S.J. Paper, 0 07
STORIES FOR FIRST COMMUNICANTS. KELLER. *net*, 0 50
STORY OF JESUS SIMPLY TOLD FOR THE YOUNG. MULHOLLAND. 0 60
STORY OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. LYNCH, S.J. *net*, 1 75
STORY OF THE DIVINE CHILD. LINGS. 0 35
STORY OF THE FRIENDS OF JESUS. RELIGIOUS H. C. J. 0 35
STORIES OF THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. 0 35
SUNDAY MISSAL, THE. LASANCE. Imitation leather, 0.75; American seal. 1 25
SUNDAY-SCHOOL DIRECTOR'S GUIDE. SLOAN. *net*, 0 75
SUNDAY-SCHOOL TEACHER'S GUIDE. SLOAN. 0 50
SURE WAY TO A HAPPY MARRIAGE. TAYLOR. 0 50
TALKS WITH THE LITTLE ONES ABOUT THE APOSTLES' CREED. RELIGIOUS H. C. J. 0 35

Digitized by Google

THOUGHTS AND AFFECTIONS ON THE PASSION OF JESUS CHRIST FOR EVERY DAY OF THE YEAR. BERGAMO, O.M.Cap. *net,* 2 00
THOUGHTS AND COUNSELS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN. DOSS-WIRTH. *net,* 1 25
THOUGHTS ON THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. LASANCE. *net,* 1 50
TRAINING OF CHILDREN AND OF GIRLS IN THEIR TEENS. MADAME CECILIA. Paper, 0.25; Cloth, 0 60
TRUE POLITENESS. DEMORE. *net,* 0 75
TRUE SPOUSE OF CHRIST. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. 1 vol. edition, 0.50; 2 vol. edition. *net,* 3 00
TWO SPIRITUAL RETREATS FOR SISTERS. ZOLLNER-WIRTH. *net,* 1 00
VENERATION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN. ROHNER-BRENNAN. 0 50
VICTORIES OF THE MARTYRS. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. *net,* 1 50
VIGIL HOUR. RYAN, S.J. Paper, 0 10
VISITS TO JESUS IN THE TABERNACLE. LASANCE. 1 25
VISITS TO THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. 0 35
VOCATION. VAN TRICHT-CONNIFF. Paper, 0 07
VOCATIONS EXPLAINED. Cloth, 0 10
WAY OF INTERIOR PEACE. DE LEHEN, S.J. *net,* 1 50
WAY OF SALVATION AND OF PERFECTION. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. *net,* 1 50
WAY OF THE CROSS. Illustrated. Paper, 0 05
WAY OF THE CROSS, THE. Large-type edition. Method of ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Illustrated. 0 15
WAY OF THE CROSS. Illustrated. Eucharistic method. 0 15
WAY OF THE CROSS. By a Jesuit Father. Illustrated. 0 15
WAY OF THE CROSS. ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. Illustrated. 0 15
WAY OF THE CROSS. Illustrated. ST. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. 0 15
WHAT CATHOLICS HAVE DONE FOR SCIENCE. BRENNAN. *net,* 1 25
WHAT THE CHURCH TEACHES. DRURY. Paper, 0.30; Cloth, 0 60
WHAT TIMES! WHAT MORALS! SEMPLE, S.J. Paper, 0.20; Cloth, 0 50
WITH CHRIST, MY FRIEND. SLOAN. *net,* 0 75
WITH GOD. LASANCE. Imitation leather, 1.25; American Seal, 2 00
WOMEN OF CATHOLICITY. SADLIER. 0 50
YOUNG MAN'S GUIDE. LASANCE. Imitation leather. 0 75

NOVELS.

AGATHA'S HARD SAYING. MULHOLLAND. 1 00
BACK TO THE WORLD. CHAMPOL. *net,* 1 35
BALLADS OF CHILDHOOD. (Poems.) EARLS, S.J. *net,* 1 00
BLACK BROTHERHOOD, THE. GARROLD, S.J. *net,* 1 35
BOND AND FREE. CONNOR. 0 50
"BUT THY LOVE AND THY GRACE." FINN, S.J. 1 00
BY THE BLUE RIVER. CLARKE. *net,* 1 35
CARROLL DARE. WAGGAMAN. 1 25
CATTLE TRAIL OF THE PRAIRIES. 0 50
CIRCUS-RIDER'S DAUGHTER. BRACKEL. 0 50
CLIMBING THE ALPS. 0 50
CONNOR D'ARCY'S STRUGGLES. BERTHOLDS. 0 50
CORINNE'S VOW. WAGGAMAN. 1 25
DAUGHTER OF KINGS. A. HINKSON. 1 25
DION AND THE SIBYLS. KEON 0 50
DOUBLE KNOT. A. AND OTHER STORIES. 0 50
ELDER MISS AINSBOROUGH. TAGGART. 1 25
ESQUIMAUX, THE. 0 50
FABIOLA. WISEMAN. 0 50
FABIOLA'S SISTERS. CLARKE. 0 50
FATAL BEACON, THE. BRACKEL. 1 25
FAUSTULA. AYSCOUGH *net,* 1 35
FINE CLAY. CLARKE. *net,* 1 35
FLOWERS OF THE CLOISTER. (Poems.) LA MOTTE. 1 25
FORGIVE AND FORGET. LINGEN. 0 50
FRIENDLY LITTLE HOUSE, THE, AND OTHER STORIES. 0 50
FURS AND FUR HUNTERS. 0 50
GRAPES OF THORNS. WAGGAMAN. *net,* 1 25
HANDLING MAIL FOR MILLIONS. 0 50
HEART OF A MAN, THE. MAHER. *net,* 1 35

Digitized by Google

HEARTS OF GOLD. EDHOR. 1 25
HEIRESS OF CRONENSTEIN. HAHN-HAHN. 0 50
HER BLIND FOLLY. HOLT. 1 25
HER FATHER'S DAUGHTER. HINKSON. 1 25
HER FATHER'S SHARE POWER. *net,* 1 25
HER JOURNEY'S END. COOKE. 0 50
IDOLS: OR THE SECRET OF THE RUE CHAUSSEE D'ANTIN. NAVERY. 0 50
IN GOD'S GOOD TIME. ROSS. 0 50
IN THE DAYS OF KING HAL. TAGGART. 1 25
IVY HEDGE, THE. EGAN. *net,* 1 35
KIND HEARTS AND CORONETS. HARRISON. 1 25
LADY OF THE TOWER, THE, AND OTHER STORIES. 0 50
LIFE UNDERGROUND. 0 50
LIGHT OF HIS COUNTENANCE. HARTL. 0 50
"LIKE UNTO A MERCHANT." GRAY. *net,* 1 35
LINKED LIVES. DOUGLAS. *net,* 1 35
LITTLE CARDINAL, THE. PARR. 1 25
MARCELLA GRACE. MULHOLLAND. 0 50
MARIAE COROLLA. (Poems.) HILL, C.P. 1 25
MARIE OF THE HOUSE D'ANTERS. EARLS, S.J. *net,* 1 35
MELCHIOR OF BOSTON. EARLS, S.J. 1 00
MIGHTY FRIEND, THE. L'ERMITE. *net,* 1 35
MIRROR OF SHALOTT. BENSON. *net,* 1 35
MISS ERIN, FRANCIS. 0 50
MONK'S PARDON, THE. NAVERY. 0 50
MR. BILLY BUTTONS. LECKY. 1 25
MY LADY BEATRICE. COOKE. 0 50
NOT A JUDGMENT. KEON. 1 25
ON PATROL WITH A BOUNDARY RIDER. 0 50
ONLY ANNE. CLARKE. *net,* 1 35
OTHER MISS LISLE, THE. MARTIN. 0 50
OUT OF BONDAGE. HOLT. 1 25
OUTLAW OF CAMARGUE. LAMOTHE. 0 50
PASSING SHADOWS. YORKE. 1 25
PAT. HINKSON. *net,* 1 35
PERE MONNIER'S WARD. LECKY. 1 25
PILKINGTON HEIR, THE. SADLIER. 1 25
PRISONERS' YEARS. CLARKE. *net,* 1 35
PRODIGAL'S DAUGHTER, THE. BUGG. 1 00
PROPHET'S WIFE, THE. BROWNE. 1 25
RED INN OF ST. LYPHAR. SADLIER. 1 25
REST HOUSE, THE. CLARKE. *net,* 1 35
ROAD BEYOND THE TOWN, AND OTHER POEMS. EARLS. 1 25
ROSE OF THE WORLD. MARTIN. 0 50
ROUND TABLE OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. 0 50
ROUND TABLE OF FRENCH CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. 0 50
ROUND TABLE OF GERMAN CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. 0 50
ROUND TABLE OF IRISH AND ENGLISH CATHOLIC NOVELISTS. 0 50
RULER OF THE KINGDOM, THE. KEON. 1 25
SECRET CITADEL, THE. CLARKE. *net,* 1 35
SECRET OF THE GREEN VASE, COOKE. 0 50
SENIOR LIEUTENANT'S WAGER, THE, AND OTHER STORIES. 0 50
SHADOW OF EVERSLEIGH, THE. LANSDOWNE. 0 50
SHIELD OF SILENCE, THE. HENRY-RUFFIN. *net,* 1 35
SO AS BY FIRE, CONNOR. 0 50
SOGGARTH AROON, THE. GUINAN. 1 25
SON OF SIRO, COPUS, S.J. *net,* 1 35
STORY OF CECILIA. HINKSON. *net,* 1 35
STREET SCENES IN DIFFERENT LANDS. 0 50
STUORE. (Stories.) EARLS, S.J. 1 00
TEMPEST OF THE HEART. THE. GRAY. 0 50
TEST OF COURAGE. THE. ROSS. 0 50
THAT MAN'S DAUGHTER. ROSS. 1 25
THEIR CHOICE. SKINNER. 0 50
THROUGH THE DESERT. SIENKIEWICZ. *net,* 1 35
TRAIL OF THE DRAGON, THE, AND OTHER STORIES. 0 50
TRAINING OF SILAS. DEVINE. 1 [illegible]

Digitized by Google

TRUE STORY OF MASTER GERARD. SADLIER. 1 25
TURN OF THE TIDE. GRAY. 0 50
UNBIDDEN GUEST, THE. COOKE. 0 50
UNDER THE CEDARS AND THE STARS. SHEEHAN. *net,* 1 50
UNRAVELLING OF A TANGLE. TAGGART. 1 25
UP IN ARDMUIRLAND. BARRETT. O.S.B. *net,* 1 25
VOCATION OF EDWARD CONWAY. EGAN. 1 25
WARGRAVE TRUST, THE. REID. 1 25
WAY THAT LED BEYOND, THE. HARRISON. 1 25
WEDDING BELLS OF GLENDALOUGH. EARLS, S.J. *net,* 1 35
WEST AND THE GREAT PETRIFIED FOREST, THE. 0 50
WHEN LOVE IS STRONG. KEON. 1 25
WINNING OF THE NEW WEST, THE 0 50
WOMAN OF FORTUNE. REID. 1 25

JUVENILES

ADVENTURE WITH THE APACHES. FERRY. 0 35
ALTHEA. NIRDLINGER. 0 50
AS GOLD IN THE FURNACE. COPUS. 1 00
AS TRUE AS GOLD. MANNIX. 0 35
BELL FOUNDRY. SCHACHING. 0 35
BERKLEYS, THE. WIGHT. 0 35
BEST FOOT FORWARD, THE. FINN. 1 00
BETWEEN FRIENDS. AUMERLE. 0 50
BISTOURI. MELANDRI. 0 35
BLISSLYVANIA POST-OFFICE, THE. TAGGART. 0 35
BOB O'LINK. WAGGAMAN. 0 35
BROWNIE AND I. AUMERLE. 0 50
BUNT AND BILL. MULHOLLAND. 0 35
BY BRANSCOME RIVER. TAGGART. 0 35
CAMP BY COPPER RIVER. SPALDING. 1 00
CAPTAIN TED. WAGGAMAN. 0 50
CAVE BY THE BEACH FORK. SPALDING. 1 00
CHARLIE CHITTYWICK. BEARNE. 1 00
CHILDREN OF CUPA. MANNIX. 0 35
CHILDREN OF THE LOG CABIN. DELAMARE. 0 50
CLARE LORAINE. "LEE." 0 50
CLAUDE LIGHTFOOT. FINN. 1 00
COLLEGE BOY, A. YORKE. 1 00
CUPA REVISITED. MANNIX. 0 35
CUPID OF CAMPION. FINN. 1 00
DADDY DAN. WAGGAMAN. 0 35
DEAR FRIENDS. NIRDLINGER. 0 50
DIMPLING'S SUCCESS. MULHOLLAND. 0 35
ETHELRED PRESTON. FINN. 1 00
EVERY-DAY GIRL, AN. CROWLEY. 0 35
FAIRY OF THE SNOWS, THE. FINN. 1 00
FIVE BIRDS IN A NEST. DELAMARE. 0 50
FIVE O'CLOCK STORIES. 0 75
FLOWER OF THE FLOCK, THE. EGAN. 1 00
FOR THE WHITE ROSE. HINKSON. 0 35
FRED'S LITTLE DAUGHTER. SMITH. 0 35
FREDDY CARR'S ADVENTURES. GARROLD. 0 50
FREDDY CARR AND HIS FRIENDS. GARROLD. 0 50
GOLDEN LILY, THE. HINKSON. 0 35
GREAT CAPTAIN, THE. HINKSON. 0 35
GUILD BOYS' PLAY AT RIDINGDALE. BEARNE. 1 00
HALDEMAN CHILDREN, THE. MANNIX. 0 35
HARMONY FLATS. WHITMIRE. 0 50
HARRY DEE. FINN. 1 00
HARRY RUSSELL. COPUS. 1 00
HEIR OF DREAMS, AN. O'MALLEY. 0 35
HIS FIRST AND LAST APPEARANCE. FINN. 1 00
HOSTAGE OF WAR, A. BONESTEEL. 0 35
HOW THEY WORKED THEIR WAY. EGAN. 0 50
IN QUEST OF ADVENTURE. MANNIX. 0 35
IN QUEST OF THE GOLDEN CHEST. BARTON. 0 50
JACK. RELIGIOUS H. C. J. 0 35
JACK HILDRETH ON THE NILE. TAGGART. 0 50
JACK-O'-LANTERN. WAGGAMAN. 0 35
JUNIORS OF ST. BEDE'S. BRYSON. 0 50

Digitized by Google

JUVENILE ROUND TABLE First Series, Second Series, Third Series. Each 1 00
KLONDIKE PICNIC, A. DONNELLY. 0 50
LEGENDS AND STORIES OF THE HOLY CHILD JESUS. LUTZ. 0 75
LITTLE APOSTLE ON CRUTCHES. DELAMARE. 0 35
LITTLE GIRL FROM BACK EAST. ROBERTS. 0 35
LITTLE LADY OF THE HALL. RYEMAN. 0 35
LITTLE MARSHALLS AT THE LAKE. NIXON-ROULET. 0 50
LITTLE MISSY. WAGGAMAN. 0 35
LOYAL BLUE AND ROYAL SCARLET. TAGGART. 1 00
MAD KNIGHT, THE. SCHACHING. 0 35
MADCAP SET AT ST. ANNE'S. BRUNOWE. 0 35
MAKING OF MORTLAKE. COPUS. 1 00
MARKS OF THE BEAR CLAWS. SPALDING. 1 00
MARY TRACY'S FORTUNE. SADLIER. 0 35
MELOR OF THE SILVER HAND. BEARNE. 1 00
MILLY AVELING. SMITH. 0 50
MIRALDA. JOHNSTON. 0 35
MORE FIVE O'CLOCK STORIES. 0 75
MOSTLY BOYS. FINN. 1 00
MYSTERIOUS DOORWAY. SADLIER. 0 35
MYSTERY OF CLEVERLY. BARTON. 0 50
MYSTERY OF HORNBY HALL. SADLIER. 0 50
NAN NOBODY. WAGGAMAN. 0 35
NED RIEDER. WEHS. 0 50
NEW BOYS AT RIDINGDALE. BEARNE. 1 00
NEW SCHOLAR AT ST. ANNE'S. BRUNOWE. 0 50
OLD CHARLMONT'S SEED-BED. SMITH. 0 35
OLD MILL ON THE WITHROSE. SPALDING. 1 00
ON THE OLD CAMPING GROUND. MANNIX. 1 00
OUR LADY'S LUTENIST. BEARNE. 1 00
PANCHO AND PANCHITA. MANNIX. 0 35
PAULINE ARCHER. SADLIER. 0 35
PERCY WYNN. FINN. 1 00
PERIL OF DIONYSIO, THE. MANNIX 0 35
PETRONILLA, AND OTHER STORIES. DONNELLY. 0 50
PICKLE AND PEPPER. DORSEY. 1 00
PILGRIM FROM IRELAND. CARNOT. 0 35
PLAYWATER PLOT, THE. WAGGAMAN. 0 50
POLLY DAY'S ISLAND. ROBERTS. 1 00
POVERINA BUCKENHAM. 0 50
QUEEN'S PAGE, THE. HINKSON. 0 35
QUEEN'S PROMISE, THE. WAGGAMAN. 0 50
QUEST OF MARY SELWYN. CLEMENTIA. 1 00
RACE FOR COPPER ISLAND. SPALDING. 1 00
RECRUIT TOMMY COLLINS. BONESTEEL. 0 35
RIDINGDALE FLOWER SHOW. BEARNE. 1 00
ROMANCE OF THE SILVER SHOON. BEARNE. 1 00
ST. CUTHBERT'S. COPUS. 1 00
SANDY JOE. WAGGAMAN. 1 00
SEA-GULL'S ROCK. SANDEAU. 0 35
SEVEN LITTLE MARSHALLS. NIXON-ROULET. 0 35
SHADOWS LIFTED. COPUS. 1 00
SHEER PLUCK. BEARNE. 1 00
SHERIFF OF THE BEECH FORK. SPALDING. 1 00
SHIPMATES. WAGGAMAN. 0 50
STRONG-ARM OF AVALON. WAGGAMAN. 1 00
SUGAR CAMP AND AFTER. SPALDING. 1 00
SUMMER AT WOODVILLE, A. SADLIER. 0 35
TALES AND LEGENDS OF THE MIDDLE AGES. CAPELLA. 0 75
TALISMAN, THE. SADLIER. 0 50
TAMING OF POLLY, THE. DORSEY. 1 00
THAT FOOTBALL GAME. FINN. 1 00
THAT OFFICE BOY. FINN. 1 00
THREE LITTLE GIRLS, AND ESPECIALLY ONE. TAGGART. 0 35
TOLD IN THE TWILIGHT. SALOME. 0 50
TOM LOSELY: BOY. COPUS. 1 00
TOM PLAYFAIR. FINN. 1 00
TOM'S LUCK-POT. WAGGAMAN. 0 35
TOORALLADDY. By JULIA C. WALSH. 0 35

Digitized by Google

TRANSPLANTING OF TESSIE. WAGGAMAN.	0 50
TREASURE OF NUGGET MOUNTAIN. TAGGART.	0 50
TWO LITTLE GIRLS. MACK.	0 35
UNCLE FRANK'S MARY. CLEMENTIA.	1 00
UPS AND DOWNS OF MARJORIE. WAGGAMAN.	0 35
VIOLIN MAKER, THE. Adapted by SARA TRAINER SMITH.	0 35
WAYWARD WINIFRED. SADLIER.	1 00
WINNETOU, THE APACHE KNIGHT. TAGGART.	0 50
WITCH OF RIDINGDALE. BEARNE.	1 00
YOUNG COLOR GUARD. BONESTEEL.	0 35

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

TRANSPLANTING OF TE
TREASURE OF NUGGET
TWO LITTLE GIRLS. M
UNCLE FRANK'S MARY.
UPS AND DOWNS OF M
VIOLIN MAKER, THE. A
WAYWARD WINIFRED.
WINNETOU, THE APACH
WITCH OF RIDINGDALE
YOUNG COLOR GUARD.

(A/J.C.)

Digitized by Google

3 2044 069 660 587

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

*Non-receipt of overdue notices does **not** exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

Andover-Harvard Theological Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-5788

Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve library collections at Harvard.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google